283.
046J
So11
C.2

283.046J
5011
c.2

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK 11, N. Y.

The Gift of
The Rev. Dr. Powel Mills Dawley
1970

Cannon St Preston

EN. DIEU. EST. MA. FOY.

George Anthony Legh Keck.

P. M. Dawley
from
[illegible]

January 1957

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_T3-CBR-752

C.X.5(v)

ELIZABETHAN

RELIGIOUS HISTORY.

BY

HENRY SOAMES, M.A.

AUTHOR OF THE HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION, AND OF THE ANGLO-SAXON CHURCH.

LONDON:
JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.
M.DCCC.XXXIX.

pp xvii 4 638.

283.046J
S011
c.2

177513

TO THE
MOST REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,
WILLIAM,
BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE,
LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY,
PRIMATE OF ALL ENGLAND, AND METROPOLITAN.

My Lord Archbishop,

This volume would humbly seek notice under protection of the approval, publicly given by your Grace, when Bishop of London, to a former work[1], accompanied by an expressed wish for its continuance to modern times. It is needless to detail the reasons why a desire so encouraging has hitherto seemed unregarded. Some of them are before the world, in the form of other publications. A design, however, of answering the gratifying call, has never been out of sight, and for the last three years, it has regularly occupied a large portion of my leisure. Farther progress, it was expected, might have been made, before this. But religious movements under Elizabeth, have an importance that forbade sufficient compression. For the present view of them, nothing could be more desirable, than a direct sanction from your Grace. But it shews existing parties, both civil and religious, in their origin and earliest years. Hence, permission to dedicate has not been asked, because, if granted, it might be misrepresented. It is hoped, however, that use of a venerated name without authority, may be kindly pardoned, and that nothing unfair has been admitted into pages, which sue for favour from one of the mildest and most considerate of Christian prelates.

---

[1] *The History of the Reformation.*

The subject concerns most closely that illustrious see which your Grace has now filled, with an enviable share of national respect, during several years. The long primacies of your admirable predecessors, Parker and Whitgift, appear, under Providence, to have saved our paternal branch of the Catholic Church. Your Grace, too, has been thrown upon a struggling and anxious period. Its issue would be far less promising, had not caution, judiciously tempered with concession, given an auspicious tone to ecclesiastical affairs. All history proclaims, that popular advantages, once gained, can never wholly be retracted. It shews, however, also, that a temperate but firm resistance to a spirit of unreasonable encroachment, is ratified by the cooler judgment of an after day. Even Archbishop Parker saw the decline of that clamour against vestures and ceremonies, which once gave him so much uneasiness. Archbishop Whitgift was equally fortunate as to consistorian oligarchy. Thus Elizabethan religious history not only proves the wisdom of that disposition, recently shewn, to remove real evils, and answer just expectations, but also the safety of resisting demands ruinous to valuable institutions.

An earnest hope, that your Grace's services, proved so inestimable in these trying times, may long be preserved to the Church of England, is general among her ministers, and warmest friends. By no one, my Lord Archbishop, is this national benefit more earnestly desired, than by

Your Grace's
Most humble and devoted Servant,
THE AUTHOR.

Furneux Pelham,
Nov. 3, 1838.

PREFACE.

THE reign of Elizabeth is really the origin of modern English society. Under the first Tudor, feudality was broken up. The next three were chiefly occupied in promoting or resisting the Reformation. The last saw that great change pretty firmly seated in public opinion. Thus the bare necessity for some religious alteration became no longer an engrossing subject, and the fermentable mass of national feeling required new channels. These were necessarily found by religion: recent agitation allowing no other. A few years brought them prominently forward in the shape of Nonconformity, both Romish and Protestant, carrying political party in its rear.

An ecclesiastical view of the Elizabethan age is therefore, not only necessary for a right understanding of an important reign, but also for a due estimate of influences yet at work upon the country. General readers, however, have chiefly thought of civil history, when attentive to this interesting period. Sufficient prominence has rarely been given to its religious affairs without sectarian objects. This has, probably, arisen from a deficiency in the available sources of information. Strype is the great historical authority for ecclesiastical matters, in this reign. He has illustrated them in his *Annals*, *Parker*, *Grindal*, *Whitgift*, *Aylmer*, and *Smith*. But these works extend over sixteen octavo volumes in the recent Oxford edition. For working such a mine of half-forgotten facts, very few have time, or other means, even if they do not want inclination. In Strype's vast magazine, too, much is really superfluous to those who are not seeking civil, or antiquarian information, or who do not value ecclesiastical particulars of the minuter kinds. The laborious and amiable compiler, also, seems never to have thought of arrangement, or of presenting his readers with anything like a carefully-prepared narrative. He merely worked-up the enormous stores, accumulated by his industry and liberality, in chronological order. Even this has not been done during the last years to which his *Annals* relate. At 1588, he gave over all thought of farther compilation, on account of his great age. From that year to the queen's death, he has merely printed the records provided as vouchers for his fidelity. Thus those, whom time and patience will allow to seek from Strype, the origin of existing English parties, will find fifteen years, in his principal work upon Elizabeth's reign, awaiting a narrative from some other pen.

Such as are aware that Strype's volumes are rather masses of materials than literary works, and also that Elizabeth's reign is of the highest religious importance, have long called for some writer to fill up this deficiency in English history. Ecclesiastical information has been wanted, at once succinct, and sufficiently full upon leading points. To supply such, the present volume has been undertaken. While it was in progress, the Author saw, with sincere gratification, a call upon him to the task, from a quarter to which the public has been repeatedly obliged[1]. This was naturally a great encouragement, but in thankfully recording it, he would only urge the difficulty of answering expectations so kindly expressed.

The plan adopted in compiling the following pages, was to seek information from contemporaries, and to detail contemporary views. With both, the facts and comments of modern authors, hostile to the Church of England, were then compared. These have generally been transcribed, and will be found in the notes. Thus the volume contains not only such a version of the history as appeared most worthy of reliance, but also the lights in which it is placed by sectarians. All branches of their body, both Romish and Protestant, are naturally anxious to make out a good case for themselves in the reign which saw Englishmen separate from the Church of their fathers, then recently defecated from inveterate impurities. Romish Nonconformists would, indeed, fain lay separation upon the Church party; many students of Elizabethan history have ever thought, with very little justice. The means of forming an opinion upon this, and other collateral questions, have, however, it is hoped, been fairly and adequately given; nothing being excluded that seemed at all material, because it clashed with the writer's own conviction.

---

[1] In a note to WATSON'S *Important Considerations*, lately reprinted, with the Prefatory Epistle, by the Rev. Joseph Mendham, M.A.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

A. D.

1563. The Vesture Controversy . . 16
Archbishop Parker 19
Archbishop Young 20
Bishop Grindal 21
Bishop Pilkington 22
Bishop Horne 24
Bishop Jewel 24
Bishop Sandys 25
The Royal *Injunctions* 27
Sampson and Humphrey . . . 29
Want of a Vent for Ascetic Views . . 31
Want of Preachers . . . 32
Hasty and irregular Ordinations . . . 34
Rise of Democratic Sentiments . . 35
Policy of adhering to the Vestures . . 37

1564. Irregularities in Ministration . . 39
Episcopal Connivance 40
The *Advertisements* . . . 42
Temporary Restoration of Conformity in London . 44
Session of the High Commission Court at Lambeth 45
More general Enforcement of Conformity . 46
Dudley, Earl of Leicester . . . 48
Appeals to him from Anti-vesturists . 49
Their Opinions controverted . . . 50
Rise of the Party Names, *Precisian* and *Puritan* . 52

A. D.		PAGE
1565.	Sampson ejected from the Deanery of Christchurch	54
	Withers	57
	Cambridge Preaching Licenses	58
	Anti-vestural Party at Cambridge	59
1566.	Deprivations at Lambeth	61
	Vestures attacked by the Press	63
	Impolicy of Concession	67
	Injudicious Defence of Conformity	69
	Restraints upon the Press	70
	The Bishops Boner and Horne	71
	Popularity of Bishop Coverdale	73
1567.	Inconformity of Foxe, the Martyrologist	74
	Rising Violence of the Puritans	75
	The Separation	76

CHAPTER II.

1568.	Mary Queen of Scots	79
	Pius V.	88
	The Seminaries	92
	First Papal Conspiracy against England	98
	Attendance of Mary at English Prayers	99
	First Papal Mission to England	100
	Harding	101
	Sanders	103
	Injury to the Religious Character of Rome	105
	Morton	107
1569.	Papal Preparations	108
	The Conspiracy partially discovered	110
	The Duke of Norfolk arrested	112
	The Northern Rebellion	113
1570.	The Papal Bull to dethrone the Queen	121
	Disliked by many English Romanists	124
	Felton's publication of the Bull	125
	The Romish Secession	127
1571.	New Penalties against Romanism	133

CHAPTER III.

A. D.		PAGE
1571.	Clamour for the *Discipline*	137
	Cartwright	141
	Puritanical Party in the House of Commons	147
	Conference of a Committee with the Prelates	148
	Act *for Ministers to be of sound Religion*	149
	Assent to the Doctrinal Articles only	149
	Contested Clause in the Twentieth Article	152
	Canons enacted by Convocation	158
	Puritans cited before the High Commission	159
	The Northampton Regulations	159
	The *Prophesyings*	160
	Proceedings in Parliament	162
1572.	The *Admonition to the Parliament*	163
	Its ostensible Authors committed	173
	Whitgift's *Answer*, and *Defense*	175
	Establishment of a Presbytery at Wandsworth	186
	Proclamation against Puritanical Books	187

CHAPTER IV.

	Puritanical Conferences	188
1573.	Chark	189
	Dering	191
	Proclamations against Puritanism	193
	Birchet	195
	Cartwright eludes an Order for his Arrest	198
1574.	Renewed attack upon the *Prophesyings*	199
	Puritanical Impostures	202
1575.	Death and Character of Archbishop Parker	205
	Persecution of Foreign Sectaries	213
	The Family of Love	214
	Archbishop Grindal	218
1576.	Proceedings in Parliament	220
	The Fifteen Articles	222

A. D. PAGE
1577. Suppression of the *Prophesyings* . . 223
Gilby 227
1578. Browne 228
1579. Whittingham 230
Burning of Matthew Hammond . . 234
Stubbe 235
Puritan Incumbents refuse Liturgical Services . 241
Puritans undermine Ancient Religious Usages . 243

CHAPTER V.

Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day . 248
Mayne 255
1580. The Jesuits 260
Persons 264
Campion 269
Their arrival in England . . . 274
Papal Invasion of Ireland . . . 278
Proclamation against the Jesuits . . 281
1581. New Legislative Severities against Papists . 282
First Disagreements in the Romish body . 284
Campion's *Ten Reasons* . . . 288
He is tortured 294
He disputes 297
Is tried 301
Executed 306
1582. Other Executions . . . 307
Controversy upon English Persecution . 308
1583. Case of Somerville and Arden . . 310
Carter, the Printer . . . 312
1584. Throgmorton 314
Creighton 321
The Association 322
New Legislative Severities against Popery . 324
1585. Parry 325
Petition in favour of Romanism . 338
Deportation of Romish Priests . . . 340

A. D. PAGE
1585. The Seminary at Rheims . . . 341
1586. Babington's Conspiracy . . . 342
1587. Decapitation of Mary Queen of Scots . 349
Desertion of Sir William Stanley . . 350
1588. Burnings for Heresy . . . 353
The Spanish *Armada* 355
The Spanish Party . . . 360

CHAPTER VI.

Puritanical Bias at the Council-board . . 366
Preferment of Archbishop Whitgift . 368
The *Mar-Prelate* Libels . . . 370
Answers to them 373
Pluralities 375
1589. Bancroft's Sermon at St. Paul's Cross . 377
Puritanical Organization . . . 381
Arrest of Cartwright . . . 385
Udal 390
Cawdrey 395
Hacket 398
1592. Final release of Cartwright . . 401
The Oath *ex officio* 402
Cosin's Defence of it . . . 404
1593. Taken in some instances . . . 407
Lax enforcement of Subscription . . 409
Papal claims over England, unconstitutional . 410
Attacks in Parliament upon the Oath *ex officio* 411
Act against Protestant Recusancy . . 413
Greenwood and Barrow . . . 416
Penry 422
Barrowism 428
Romish Conformity of Henry IV. . . 430
Pretensions of the *Infanta* . . . 432
1594. Conspiracy of Lopez 433
Concealments 437
Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* . . . 441

CHAPTER VII.

A.D.		PAGE
1594.	Rise of Doctrinal Disagreement in the Church .	453
1595.	The Sabbatarian Controversy . .	458
	The Predestinarian Controversy . .	463
	The Lambeth Articles . . .	465
1596.	Controversial Sermons at Cambridge . .	471
	The Calvinistic and anti-Calvinistic parties .	473
1597.	Controversy about Christ's Descent into Hell .	476
	Fanatical Impostures . . .	478
	Judicial Intemperance against Puritanism .	483
	Ecclesiastical Courts attacked by the Commons	485
	Legislative Security given to Ecclesiastical Appointments	486
	Articuli pro Clero confirmed by Royal Authority	488
1598.	Disagreement between the Jesuits and Romish Seculars	488
	Squire's Treason . .	491
1600.	Papal Movements in Ireland . .	495
	Papal Designs upon the Succession . .	498
1601.	The Queen's last Parliament . .	500
	Proclamation against Jesuits and their Adherents	502
1602.	Protestation of the thirteen Romish Priests .	504
	Disgust of the violent Romanists . .	505
	Appointment of the Archpriest . .	506
1603.	Death and Character of the Queen . .	507
	Accession of James I. . . .	515
	Apprehensions of the Church Party . .	517
	The Millenary Petition . . .	518
	Counter Movements	520
	Raleigh's Conspiracy . . .	522
	Watson and Clarke	525
	Proclamation against Puritanical Petitions .	529
1604.	Hampton-Court Conference . . .	530
	Death and Character of Archbishop Whitgift	555
	Conclusion . . .	565

PAGE
EXECUTIONS FOR RELIGION UNDER ELIZABETH . 595
POPES DURING THE ELIZABETHAN PERIOD . 601
ENGLISH PRELACY DURING THE ELIZABETHAN PERIOD. . . . 603
INDEX 613

ELIZABETHAN
RELIGIOUS HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

ORIGIN OF PROTESTANT NONCONFORMITY.

1563—1567.

INTRODUCTION — MODERATION OF ELIZABETH'S RELIGIOUS POLICY — GENERAL CONFORMITY OF THE ROMISH PARTY — PERSONAL PREPOSSESSIONS OF THE QUEEN AND ARCHBISHOP PARKER—LUTHERAN PARTY—PREJUDICES OF THE EXILES—THE ARCHBISHOP'S VIEW OF THE VESTURE CONTROVERSY—ARCHBISHOP YOUNG—BISHOP GRINDAL—BISHOP PILKINGTON—BISHOP HORNE—BISHOP JEWEL—BISHOP SANDYS—UNIFORM VIEWS OF THE BISHOPS FROM EXILE—SAMPSON—HUMPHREY—BULLINGER TOLERANT OF THE HABITS—THE ANTI-VESTURAL PARTY—WANT OF A VENT FOR ASCETIC VIEWS—WANT OF PREACHERS—HASTY AND IRREGULAR ORDINATIONS—RISE OF DEMOCRATIC SENTIMENTS—POLICY OF ADHERING TO THE VESTURES—ROMISH DISCONTENT—IRREGULARITIES IN MINISTRATIONS—EPISCOPAL CONNIVANCE — THE ADVERTISEMENTS — TEMPORARY RESTORATION OF CONFORMITY IN LONDON—SESSION OF THE HIGH COMMISSION COURT, AT LAMBETH—MORE GENERAL ENFORCEMENT OF CONFORMITY—DUDLEY, EARL OF LEICESTER—APPEALS TO HIM FROM ANTI-VESTURISTS—THEIR OPINIONS CONTROVERTED—RISE OF THE PARTY-NAMES, PRECISIAN AND PURITAN—SAMPSON EJECTED FROM HIS DEANERY—WITHERS—CAMBRIDGE PREACHING LICENCES—ANTI-VESTURAL PARTY IN THAT UNIVERSITY—DEPRIVATIONS AT LAMBETH—VESTURES ATTACKED FROM THE PRESS—IMPOLICY OF CONCESSION—INJUDICIOUS DEFENCE OF CONFORMITY—RESTRAINTS UPON THE PRESS—THE BISHOPS BONER AND HORNE—POPULARITY OF BISHOP COVERDALE—INCONFORMITY OF FOXE—RISING VIOLENCE OF THE PURITANS—THE SEPARATION.

THE reign of Elizabeth is one of those periods that give to nations a lasting impulse. It raised England, hitherto a secondary power, to a proud equality with France and

Spain. Yet Scotland was a separate kingdom, and Ireland severely burthensome. Hence a fabric of substantial greatness required consummate skill. Its progress, too, was impeded by very serious difficulties. Spanish hostility was always on the watch. Domestic discontent raged fiercely, during many years, from two opposite extremes. Mere good fortune could never have overcome such obstacles to social improvement. Without able rulers, national prosperity is but a gleam alternating with storm.

To the ability of Elizabeth's civil policy, ample justice has been done. Her ecclesiastical government has been less fortunate: although under it arose the religious parties, ever since in active collision. Their germs, indeed, belong to earlier times. Romanists long reckoned upon Trent, for silencing Protestant objections to their church. The Reformers were unanimous in little more, than in resisting papal usurpation, and renouncing unwritten tradition, as an authority for articles of faith. Within these landmarks was left a wide field of debateable ground, in which stirring spirits were continually marking and occupying new positions. Religious views being thus imperfectly developed, many thought Protestant and Romish differences likely to be merged, without much difficulty or delay, in one harmonious whole. As this expectation weakened, complete union among Protestants was yet a cherished aim. When, however, the two parties had minutely canvassed opinions, and sharpened animosities, England and Rome were found irreconcileably at variance. Elements also were gradually detected in English Protestantism, defying fusion into an homogeneous mass.

Elizabeth lived among these attempts and discoveries.

Religious uniformity was her deliberate aim, and every year made it more hopeless. In spite of strenuous exertions, three great religious parties became distinctly marked, and widely separated. Of such commanding national divisions, the first steps are both interesting and instructive. Yet facilities for tracing them are not generally available. Nonconformity, both Romish and Protestant, has, indeed, been sufficiently alive to the importance of this reign. Each has blazoned a picture of oppression, with zeal and effect: unhappily, too, with considerable truth. The Church has not been served with equal attention to public opinion. Means are needed of adequate yet moderate extent, for duly contemplating not one only, but all the three great religious parties, as they actually rose. Without such convenient opportunities, the bulk of men cannot judge accurately of the national society, as now existing.

The queen's earliest years properly belong to the History of the Reformation. Until the Thirty-nine Articles were legally settled, Romanism could hardly be considered as completely and hopelessly overthrown. Even then, the national mind was only prepared for striking out new channels. Individuals, more or less disregarded, took time to recover from the mortification of discomfiture, before they banded into distinguishable sections. The Romish party, when completely formed, remained unaffected by the queen's death. It soon indulged in little more than hope of favourable treatment under her successor. Not so the discontented Protestants. They reckoned still upon a command over the Establishment, and, until disappointed at the Hampton Court Conference, did not settle down into a hostile aggregate of sects. Thus the history of religious party, under Elizabeth, properly begins a few years after her accession, and extends to the blighting of Puritanical hopes, within the first year of James. It opens with a church just provided with authentic terms of communion, and closes with a new settlement of that body, after a formal collision with her more dangerous opponent.

The whole period embraces forty-one years. The first of these are important rather than interesting to a modern reader. He would hardly care for a strife about some few externals, were it not the first storing of that fuel which fed eventually so many raging fires. After this preliminary burst, both the discontented parties played agitated, conspicuous parts. Romanism took at once an active political position. Of this, however, there are two distinct stages. In the first, Romish hopes chiefly centred in Mary of Scotland, supported by foreign intrigue, and displaced, or dissembling native secular clergymen. The second opens with that unhappy princess as the tool of plotting Jesuits, and wholly turns upon the agency of their order. In Protestant opposition also, there are two divisions, after a discontented party was irrevocably formed. The first was a struggle, unconnected with doctrine, for modelling the Establishment after the example of Geneva. The second shows the same principle at work, but in conjunction with doctrinal disagreement. Protestant opposition likewise threw out Independency, the genuine parent of modern dissent in all its various forms. But this religious movement, big with eventual importance, makes no very conspicuous figure in Elizabethan history. It rather assimilates with indications of Protestant discontent, barely discernible under Edward.

Elizabeth often passes as the rash provoker of those religious dissensions which caused her so much embarrassment and danger. But this is a hasty view. To say nothing of existing unacquaintance with toleration, her settlement of the Church really seemed at first likely to encounter no acrimonious or lasting opposition. It was, indeed, a wise and moderate disposal of many difficult and pressing questions. Although her accession overthrew the Marian system, she is hardly even chargeable with violence to an established religion. There was interference, undoubtedly, with possession. But this may be no sufficient evidence of original intention. Many of our older meeting-houses are occupied by Socinians. To pronounce them built for that sect, would notoriously be a most unsound conclusion. There were competent inquirers who considered churches perverted similarly from the intentions of their founders. None were able to disprove this impression. None could even point out any authentic standard of the doctrine taught in these venerable fabrics. With all her claims to take the lead in religion, Rome did not remedy this capital defect, until the Council of Trent broke up, at the very close of 1563[1]

---

[1] Dec. 4. The Trentine decrees were confirmed by the pope, without any reserve, Jan. 26, 1564. Pius felt, however, far from certain of their acceptance even by states friendly to Rome. Hence he used immediately every exertion to attain this end. *Non prima fù terminato il Concilio che 'l Papa mise ogni industria perch' egli fosse ricevuto da tutti i signori Cattolici.* (PALLAV. ii. 1043.) He was first gratified by the Venetians, who published the decrees of the council, at a solemn mass, in the church of St. Mark, and rendered them binding throughout their states. The Pope testified his gratification, by granting to the republic a magnificent palace at Rome, built for himself and his successors, by Paul II. A like obsequiousness was displayed by the other Italian states. Sigismund, king of Poland, being privately gained by Commendone, the papal nuncio, introduced him with the decrees in his hand, Aug. 17, 1564, to the Diet, then assembled at Warsaw. Ucangius, archbishop of Gnesna, whom Pallavicino charges with a strong disposition towards heresy, would have had the volume examined before it was approved. But Sigismund overruled him, insisting upon a murmur, then

Until then, modern Romish principles were not, in strict accuracy, established anywhere. They could plead nothing beyond a questioned, and really questionable possession. In the first month of that very year, the English Convocation accepted King Edward's articles, with some slight modifications[1]. Thus although the Anglican and

---

heard through the assembly, as an evidence of consent. He then, with some applause, but without any voting, pronounced the decrees carried. Four Spanish provincial councils accepted the decrees in 1565. But Rome was dissatisfied, because not papal, but royal authority, was alleged as the ground of proceeding. In France, the council has never been formally received, although the court of Rome long strove earnestly against a mortification so severe. It has often been alleged, that this opposition arose wholly from decrees of discipline, esteemed prejudicial to the liberties of the Gallican church, and the royal prerogatives of France. But this representation is not accurate. The first refusal came through Catharine de' Medici, who not only excepted against decrees injurious to civil rights, but also pleaded the necessity of considering the Hugonots. It was doctrine for which they struggled. After a series of attempts, the Ecclesiastical Chamber carried a resolution, in 1614, that objections to the council related only to discipline, no Catholic being able to reject its doctrine. In this resolution, both the nobles, and the third estate, at first refused to concur. After some explanations, the nobles retracted this refusal, but the third estate persisted in it; and here the matter finally rested. Thus France nationally has not given a formal assent even to the doctrines authenticated at Trent. Her tacit approbation of them proceeds upon the ground of their reception before the Trentine fathers sate. But it may be proved, as Le Courayer observes, that until then, they had not passed for articles of faith. (*Append. à l'Hist. du Conc. de Trente*, 696.)

England, therefore, treated the Council of Trent, as even Romish states did, out of Italy. She judged for herself. Her opinion, undoubtedly was unfavourable to the notion that the Trentine doctrines could plead any primitive or sufficient authority. Hence her rejection of them, and many learned works show that she had very good grounds for it.

[1] The Thirty-nine Articles received an unanimous assent from the English Convocation, Jan. 31, 1563. Thus the Anglican settlement is rather more than ten months anterior to the Roman. Even then, as the former note shows, the Trentine faith was not properly established anywhere, because no country had formally accepted it. Undoubtedly those nations that did so, after, at least, an appearance of domestic deliberation, and under sanction of domestic authority, pleaded in their

Roman systems are nearly contemporaneous, as to final and sufficient authentication, yet England could boast of this advantage first. With her, too, it had a solidity which papal necessities would not allow to be secured at Trent. England settled her Church on the broad ground of Catholicity. Rome was driven by present interest, and a sense of false honour, to bear away from her definitive assembly, a narrow, sectarian character. Hitherto communion with her had admitted some latitude as to the medieval compromise with lingering Paganism. None remained after the Trentine council separated. The whole mass of doctrine and usage that ages of ignorance had accumulated, was formally confirmed. Indeed, no other object seemed in view, than the finding of specious reasons for leaving it entire. Vain was the silence of Scripture, vain that of ecclesiastical antiquity. Any sanction, of any age, or pope, or council, or schoolman, was better than acknowledging that Rome had ever been mistaken, and than hazarding popularity, by paring away superstition. It seems to have been forgotten by the very body appropriating to itself the name of Catholic, that Vincent of Lerins had been unanimously approved in denying it to all who hold not what has been *believed everywhere, ever, and by all*[1]. England, happily, was not

---

justification, that the council had merely defined what they had ever believed. But this assertion wants a degree of proof which no scholar has been able to supply. With respect to England, such an assertion is demonstrably false. Transubstantiation, that mill-stone about the neck of Popery which will infallibly and irretrievably sink it, is the most important doctrine defined and confirmed at Trent. Existing contemporary records, expressly repudiating this doctrine, brand it as a surreptitious novelty in England's national belief.

[1] "In ipsa Catholica Ecclesia magnopere curandum est, ut id teneamus, *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus* creditum est. (Hoc est etenim vere proprieque Catholicum, quod ipsa vis nominis ratioque declarat, quæ omnia fere

so rash. Her divines admitted no scholastic sophistry as a sufficient support for questionable principles. They would hear nothing but the clear voices of Scripture and primitive antiquity. Hence their work was truly Catholic. It bore, as Vincent admirably demands, the genuine stamp of *Universality, Antiquity, Consent.*

Upon the calm good sense of Englishmen, this famous test was rendered effective by the religious discretion of their government. Vincent would pronounce the country Catholic, although it wore something of a new face, by the suppression of monasteries. The Church, however, had abstained from any general condemnation of the monastic system, and its extinction in England was justified under the plea of enormous abuses. In this charge notoriously was considerable justice, and besides, monachism had attained an injurious extension. Nor could its long-tried tendency to nurture superstition and imposture fail of lessening regret for its fall, in discerning and candid minds. The secular clergy, as they had long been called, who come in habitual contact with society, and originate in its religious wants, had passed uninjured through the storms of the Reformation. This had even spared cathedrals, from which something of a conventual character is inseparable. Nor in those tasteful and magnificent monuments of ancient piety, did public worship wholly lose its accustomed honours. The organ and the anthem still pealed through their vaulted aisles, the sober light

---

universaliter comprehendit) sed hoc demum fiet, si sequamur *Universitatem*, *Antiquitatem*, *Consensionem*." (VINCENTII LIRINENSIS *Commontorium*. Oxf. 1836. p. 6.) Vincent lived in the fifth century. His famous test, *Universality, Antiquity, Consent*, was expressly appealed to by Cranmer and Ridley, as it has been since, by the most eminent divines of the Church of England. It is, indeed, fatal to Romanism. Nor can Protestant dissent meet it without embarrassment.

that streamed through their "storied windows," yet exhibited God's service under a considerable degree of its wonted pomp and ceremony. This happy respect for clerical rights and laical prepossessions, acted powerfully upon all moderate men[1].

---

[1] "The Liturgie of the Church had been exceedingly well fitted for their approbation, by leaving out an offensive passage against the Pope; restoring the old form of words, accustomably used in the participation of the holy Sacrament; the total expunging of a Rubrick, which seemed to make a question of the *Real presence;* the Scituation of the holy Table in the place of the Altar; the Reverend posture of kneeling at it, or before it, by all Communicants; the retaining of so many of the ancient Festivals; and finally, by the Vestments used by the Priest or Minister in the Ministration." (HEYLIN'S *History of the Presbyterians.* Oxf. 1670. p. 259.) Neal says of the divines employed in reviewing the Liturgy:—"Their instructions were to strike out all offensive passages against the Pope, and to make people easy about the belief of the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament; but not a word in favour of the stricter Protestants. Her Majesty was afraid of reforming too far; she was desirous to retain images in churches, crucifixes and crosses, vocal and instrumental music, with all the old popish garments; it is not, therefore, to be wondered, that in reviewing the Liturgy of King Edward, no alterations were made in favour of those who now began to be called Puritans, from their attempting a purer form of worship and discipline than had yet been established. The Queen was more concerned for the Papists, and therefore, in the Litany, this passage was struck out,—*From the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities, good Lord deliver us.* The Rubrick that declared, that *by kneeling at the sacrament no adoration was intended to any corporal presence of Christ*, was expunged." (*Hist. of the Puritans.* Lond. 1793. i. 129.) It is needless to examine narrowly this representation. The historian thus himself supplies a vindication of Elizabeth's religious policy. "In short, the service performed in the Queen's chapel, and in sundry cathedrals, was so splendid and showy, that foreigners could not distinguish it from the Roman, except that it was performed in the English tongue. By this method most of the popish laity were deceived into conformity, and came regularly to church for nine or ten years, till the Pope, being out of all hopes of an accommodation, forbid them, by excommunicating the Queen, and laying the whole kingdom under an interdict." (*Ib.* 144.) Now, the parties said to have been "deceived into conformity," were two-thirds of the nation, and possessed an immense preponderance of its wealth. With most of them,

Hence hardly any of the laity, however notoriously and avowedly partial to Rome, kept away from church during Elizabeth's first five years. Few went further than feeding a fond regret for the religious forms of Mary's reign. In many cases, this yielded gradually under the free course of rational conviction[1]. Some, indeed, became anxious for toleration as a separate religious body. Their advocate was the Emperor Ferdinand, who requested for them one church in every city. But the indulgence was refused, as injurious to polity, honour, and conscience; an open contravention of parliamentary provisions; embarrassing to honest minds; prolific in sects and factions. All serious occasion for it was positively denied: no substantial religious innovation having been effected, no doctrines adopted, without ample justification from all antiquity. Ferdinand entreated also

---

the "*deception*," as it is represented, was finally successful. It found them Romanists, and left them Protestants. To many among that third of the nation, which was already Protestant, Elizabeth's reformation was perfectly satisfactory: to many others sufficiently so. It was meant, besides giving this degree of satisfaction, by steering clear of both extremes, to conciliate honest prejudice, and to satisfy moderate expectations.

[1] "Su i primi tempi, i Cattolici non si recarono gran fatto a coscienza, l' ubidire in cio alla Reina, e se vogliam così dire, buonamente si tramischiavano co' Calvinisti nelle lor chiese, e vi facevano quel medesimo che essi: sin che dalla caduta che ne seguiva di molti, i quali dal solamente occultare, come essi dicevano, la fede Cattolica, passevano al negarla." (*Dell' Istoria della Compagnia di Giesu, L' Inghilterra: dal P. Daniello Bartoli.* Rom. 1667. p. 133.) Moore makes attendance at church chiefly effective upon inferior life: where he admits its operation to have been easy; and he does not deny that few would have remained unaffected by it long. "Etsi enim pauci fortassis aliqui sat fortes futuri essent ad frequentia de superiori loco corrupti verbi ministrorum tela sustinenda, vulgus tamen facile cederet, cum immunitate a mulctis, morum licentia, et specie quadam simulata veritatis tentaretur."—*Historia Missionis Anglicanæ Soc. Jesu. Collectore Henrico Moro.* Audom. 1660. p. 66.

favourable usage for the deprived ecclesiastics. This, it was replied, had constantly been shown, insolently as they defied the laws, and impeded public tranquillity. Discredit was thrown upon their alleged scruples, by an appeal to the reigns of Henry and Edward, when these very men, then in considerable stations, advocated, both by pen and pulpit, the same opinions that they now obstinately rejected[1]. The particulars of this reply could hardly be known in England without augmenting irritation. Many must have smarted rather severely under the sting of its personal reflections. How far it may have operated upon Romish conformity, is uncertain. There was, undoubtedly, about this time, a diminished attendance of Romanists at church. Advices from Trent will, however, account for this. Ten of the leading divines there had been engaged in discussing the lawfulness and expediency of assisting at devotions not cordially approved. Among them were Peter Soto, the Dominican, and Diego Laynez, general of the Jesuits. They decided unanimously against compliance[1], and persuasions were not wanting at home to enforce their determination. Still English conformity did not cease. It was only something less through another five years. Modern Romanists would fain trace this mortifying fact to the pecuniary penalties imposed upon causeless absence from church. These must, unquestionably, have had some weight. But they were found with little or none, at a subsequent period, although greatly increased[2].

---

[1] Eliz. Reg. D. Ferd. Romm. Imp. STRYPE. *Annals.* Oxf. 1824. i. pt. 2. p. 574. Strype understands by the general indulgence requested for the bishops and others, an abstinence from proceedings against them for declining the oath of supremacy. (*Ib.* 47.) Ferdinand's letter is dated September 24, 1563. Elizabeth's reply has only the year 1563. The emperor died on the 25th of July following. (COXE. *House of Austria*, ii. 275.) He had earnestly besought from the Council of Trent, the cup for the laity, and the marriage of priests; these questions were disposed of by a discretionary power granted from the council to the pontiff. Ferdinand accordingly transferred his instances to Rome, as soon as the assembly separated. His urgency so far prevailed as to gain a decree in the papal consistory, on the 14th of July, when he was now dying, to authorise, in Germany and his patrimonial states, the cup under certain prescribed conditions, where it should be found necessary. What these were, Pallavicino does not say. But certain German bishops were commissioned to grant licenses for the desired indulgence. When these prelates died, it was doubted whether this authority was to be considered as personal, or as an appendage to their several sees. The former view was pronounced correct, and no more such commissions being issued, the papal concession extended no longer than the lives of those priests who had been licensed by the deceased bishops. (*Ist. del Conc. di Trento*, ii. 1051.) As to clerical celibacy, Ferdinand could procure no relaxation whatever. Even the concession made, Pallavicino says, raised the pope's *abhorrence*, which may readily be believed: but then he ranks whole communion among *novelties*, which is absurd. *Quantunque aborisse tali novità.*

---

[1] Bartoli. 133.

[2] By the 1 Eliz. c. 2, absence from church, on any Sunday or holiday, was punishable by a fine of "12*d*., to be levied by the churchwardens of the parish where such offence shall be done, to the use of the poor of the same parish, of the goods, lands, and tenements of such offender, by way of distress." By the 23 Eliz. c. 1, every such absentee, being over sixteen, "shall forfeit to the queen's majesty for every month, which he shall so forbear, 20*l.*; and over and besides the said forfeitures, every person so forbearing by the space of twelve months, shall (after certificate thereof in writing, made into the King's Bench, by the bishop of the diocese, or justice of assize, or justice of the peace of the county where the offender shall dwell) be bound with two sufficient sureties in 200*l.* at least, to the good behaviour, and so continue bound until he conform himself, and come to church. Which said forfeitures shall be one-third to the king to his own use; one-third to the king for the relief of the poor in the parish where the offence shall be committed, to be delivered by warrant to the principal officers in the receipt of the exchequer without further warrant from the king; and one-third to him who shall sue. And if such person shall not be able, or shall fail to pay the same within three months after judgment given, he shall be committed to prison till he have paid the same, or conform himself to go to church." (Burn. *Eccl. Law.* Lond. 1763. ii. 186, 188.) It was resolved that this severe statute did not abrogate the former one, so that offending parties were still liable to the fine of 12*d*. for

Political exasperation had, however, then forbidden the calm exercise of thought. Men were goaded on by ambitious and artful leaders. A menaced and embarrassed government was tempted into oppression. A papal party arose quite as much from hatred of its rulers, as from the force of inveterate prepossessions.

To render such a party needless, by satisfying reasonable expectations, was one reason for adopting Edward's reformation. But it was not the only reason. Romish prejudice, it is true, seems to have pervaded two-thirds of the nation[1]. This majority, however, was far less

---

every causeless absence, in addition to the fine of 20*l.* for a month's absence. The month, also, was considered as complete on the fourth Sunday; so that there were thirteen such months in a year. In the late Mr. Butler's historical work, both these statutes are mentioned with legal precision, and their united operation is given; but we are not informed, that of this, the shilling forfeiture is all that concerns the queen's first twenty-three years. This omission makes the following paragraph wear a very plausible appearance. "It is to be observed, that during the first ten years of the reign of Elizabeth, the greater number of English Catholics, to avoid the rigour of these laws, attended divine service in the Protestant churches. On the lawfulness of this occasional conformity, there appears to have been a difference of opinion among their divines. The case was regularly submitted to the opinion of some eminent theologians, then attending the Council of Trent: these pronounced such occasional conformity to be unlawful. The justice of this opinion being strenuously inculcated by the missionary priests, was soon universally acquiesced in by the laity."—(*Hist. Memoirs of the Engl. Ir. and Scot. Cath.* Lond. 1819. i. 171.)

Upon this passage it is only needful to remark, that of the two laws, that which has by far the greater "rigour," was not enacted until twelve years, or more, after the Romish party generally had seceded from church.

[1] Sanders thus speaks of Elizabeth's earliest years:—"Divisa autem omni Anglia in tres partes, ex tribus una non erat eo tempore hæretica, nec cupiebat aut probabat mutationem religionis, nedum postea, cum sectæ perniciem esset experta." (*De Schism. Angl.* Ingolst. 1588. p. 290.) In 1586, a memorial of Creichton, a Scotish Jesuit, inciting to an invasion of England, sets forth that "the faction of the Catholics in England is great, and able, if the kingdom were divided in three parts, to make two of them."—STRYPE. *Annals.* iii. 604.

considerable for intellect than for numbers: hence it was justly and necessarily called upon for extensive concessions. Of the more intellectual minority, a large portion had no other wish than to see restored the system that Queen Mary overthrew. It had not only stood the test of many learned inquiries, but also a crowd of martyrs had sealed it with their blood. Even at this time, it is impossible to think of these self-devoted victims without feeling them to have stamped a holy and venerable character upon the Edwardian Church. But Elizabeth came to the throne among their acquaintances and relatives. Thousands of anecdotes, now lost, must have then embalmed their memories, in every part of England. To depart from a system, that had come off so gloriously, naturally appeared something like sacrilege to many judicious minds. It was a system also dear both to the queen and the primate, and each of them had large claims upon Protestants, from important services. If Elizabeth had embraced Romish principles, many of her difficulties, both at home and abroad, would have immediately vanished. Her actual determination was the greatest advantage ever yet gained by the Protestant cause. But although willing thus to disoblige a majority of her own subjects, and to incur serious risks from foreign states, she was partial to many of the religious usages in which she had been bred. The pomp and ceremony of Romish worship were agreeable to her taste. Hence the royal chapel, though it stood alone, long and repeatedly exhibited, to the scandal of many zealous Protestants, but greatly to the satisfaction of all with Romish prejudices, an altar decorated with crucifix and lights[1]. Archbishop

---

[1] "Illa enim ibi jam sola, cum ingenti Apologeticorum istorum fremitu, sed maxima omnium vere Christianorum approbatione et

Parker was, probably, far less fond of such imposing externals than his royal mistress, though he hesitated, at first, as to the expediency of retaining crosses[1]. Having, indeed, concealed himself at home during the Marian persecution, he had never seen Protestantism under any other form than that which it wore in Edward's reign. He had, accordingly, no thought of reconstructing a church upon some alleged reference to Scripture merely, —a principle hitherto unacknowledged by his countrymen. He was imbued with a deep veneration for antiquity, and had no further wish than to free the religious system immemorially established from blemishes detected by recent inquirers of undeniable competence. For this end he laboured with a patient industry, and a solidity of judgment, which have rendered most important services to the Reformation. The deliberate convictions of such a man could not fail of having great weight in the country, and they were justly entitled to it.

There was also a party anxious for the establishment of Lutheranism. By deciding upon this, Elizabeth would have given extensive satisfaction in Germany, and many princes there would have gladly entered into close alliance with her for the defence of their common faith. An advantage so obvious occasioned some apprehension in Switzerland, where the confession of Augsburg was

---

applausu in regia sua basilica imaginem crucis adhuc retinet." *Dialogi* vi., ab Alano Copo Anglo. Antv. 1566. p. 713.) In consequence of remonstrances from the bishops, Elizabeth removed the crucifix in the early part of her reign; but she replaced it in 1570.—STRYPE. *Annals*. i. 262. *Parker*. ii. 35.

[1] He argued in their favour (Neal loosely says in favour of images) before a parliamentary committee, assisted by Cox, against Grindal and Jewel. Jewel evidently anticipated ill success, and in that case he seems to have determined upon resigning his bishopric.—Juellus ad P. Mart. 4 Feb. 1560. BURNET. *Hist. Ref.* Records. Lond. 1820. iii. 387.

viewed as a badge of successful rivalry. Hence Bullinger, writing to Utenhovius, recommended Edward's reformation as one with which the pious were contented[1]. No doubt he would have been better pleased with arrangements more Calvinistic, but he saw difficulties in their way, almost insurmountable. He was, therefore, satisfied with such a settlement as should guard reformed principles in their full integrity, without giving a decided triumph to his German neighbours[2]. None, however, who approved the Augustan confession were likely to feel any lasting disappointment from the adoption of Edward's reformation. Its episcopal polity, and respect for external forms, must inevitably gain upon their affections. Thus Elizabeth's religious choice was evidently well adapted for pleasing a large and important section of her Protestant subjects. For conciliating that party which formed a majority of the whole nation, its recommendations could hardly fail of proving eventually quite equal to those of Lutheranism, and they were greatly superior to such as the Swiss reformation offered.

Viewed from the distance accordingly of Switzerland and the Rhine, England's religious policy appeared unexceptionable and judicious[1]. Among such as returned from asylums in those parts, a different feeling extensively prevailed. They had seen their own cherished opinions professed by petty societies of republicans, generally poor, none without a mercantile disposition to retrench public formalities, at once expensive and unproductive. Their continental friends naturally lauded such simplicity, and as their own penury and exile arose from a church organized upon the opposite extreme, they could hardly miss a prejudice in favour of their hosts. In this, too, they were necessarily fortified by those Helvetic prepossessions which Bishop Hooper had brought home, even in happier times. It is not surprising, therefore, that vestments and attire worn by their persecutors, should have offended most, if not all, of the Marian exiles on their arrival in England. They found, however, their clerical countrymen retaining everywhere the surplice and the corner-cap: nor could they legally decline these peculiarities themselves on their acceptance of preferment. A spiritual charge, however, was anxiously desired by all the exiles, because the Church taught no doctrines which they did not cordially approve. But many of them so abhorred the attire, statutably imposed upon their profession, that they ministered and appeared without it. At first, no great notice was taken of these irregularities. The services of able reformers, probably, were considered well worth some connivance at such scruples. The Romish, Edwardian, and Lutheran parties, were not, however, likely to approve this forbearance. The first must have been seriously offended by it, because objections to vestments and habits were advanced on grounds most insulting to the Papal Church. The propriety of distinguishing the clergy, both in their ministrations and ordinary intercourse, was not contested[1]. Only established habits were painted as empoisoned, defiled, and desecrated by the Church of Rome. Her use, like that of Baal's priests, had rendered them accursed, the livery of Antichrist, which faithful ministers could not wear without infamy and peril[2]. A government, intent upon conciliating Romish prejudice, was driven to discourage this extravagance. Its farthest indulgence could not go beyond a temporary and un-authorised forbearance, in the hope that objections, at once unsubstantial and illiberal, would wither under neglect, and soon die away. Even this temporising policy must, however, have its limits. It was an advantage to zealots of the Romish party, who did not fail to represent Protestantism as effective only to unsettle; equally the bane of public tranquillity and spiritual safety[1].

---

[1] "Video in Anglia non modicas oborituras turbas, si quod quidam (rem indignissimam multis modis) postulant, recipiatur Augustana Confessio. Vexat hoc omnes ecclesias sinceriores, et cupit suo fermento inficere omnes. Deus coherceat homines satis alioquin pios, at pietati puriori molestos. Et tu scis quod factum sit in Polonia. Cave et adjuva ne recipiatur. *Satisfacit piis Edvardi reformatio.*"—Ex Epist. MSS. in Bibl. Eccl. Belg. Lond. STRYPE. *Annals.* i. 259.

[2] "At quantum ego conjicere possum, hoc unum quærunt adversarii vestri communes, ut vobis ejectis, ut Papistas, *vel ab his non multum diversos Lutheranos*, doctores et antistites surrogent." (Bullingerus Horno. Ep. Wint. BURNET. *Hist. Ref.* Records. iii. 422.) Jewel awakened Peter Martyr's apprehensions upon this subject, by letters, dated April 28 and November 5, 1559.—*Ib.* 361, 384.

---

[1] "Me quidem malle nullas ceremonias, nisi rarissimas, obtrudi Ecclesiæ. Interim fateor, non posse statim leges de his, forte non adeo necessarias, aliquando etiam inutiles, damnari impietatis, turbasque et schisma excitare in Ecclesia, quando (videlicet) superstitione carent, et res sunt sua natura indifferentes. Facile autem credo, viros prudentes atque politicos conformitatem rituum urgere, quod existiment hanc facere ad concordiam, et quod una sit Ecclesia totius Angliæ."—Bulling. D. Laur. Humfredo, et D. Tho. Sampsoni. BURNET. *Hist. Ref.* Records. iii. 430.

---

[1] "Now if any should say, that we do this rather of singularity than of conscience, and that we are so addict to our maners that we will not change for the better, he may understand, that if our apparel seem not so modest and grave as our vocation requires, neither suffer to discern us from men of other callings, we refuse not to wear such as shal be thought to the godly and prudent magistrates for these uses most decent; so that we may ever keep ourselves pure from the defiled robes of Antichrist." (Whittingham, dean of Durham, to the earl of Leicester.) The letter appears to have been originally undated, but it has now *From Durham*, 1564, "in the hand," Strype says, "of Bishop Grindal."—*Annals.* Append. XXVII. p. 82.

[2] "God forbid that] we, by wearing the Popish attyre, as a thing but indifferent, should seem thereby to consent to their blasphemies and heresies. Surely, my Lord, it may seem to be a very poor policy to think by this means to change the nature of superstition, or to deck the spouse of Christ with the ornaments of the Babylonical strumpet, or to force the true preachers to be like in outward show to the papists, Christ's enemies. Hezekias, Josias and other famous princes, when they reformed religion according to God's word, compelled not the preachers of God to wear the apparel of Baal's priests, or of Shemarim, but utterly destroyed their garments."—*Ib. ad eund.* pp. 79, 82.

The primate's prominence in settling the Church naturally made him sensitive to such reproaches. His own good sense and sound information were securities against any undue estimate of mere externals. With his dying breath, accordingly, he disclaimed all thought of intrinsic excellence in cap, tippet, surplice, or wafer-bread. For enforcing these ancient formalities, he, and others in authority, had been stigmatised as *great Papists.* He repels the appellation as calumnious, admitting an awful responsibility were it otherwise[2]. But Parker had all the value for law and decency which experience imprints upon grave, wise, and elderly minds. Hence he was offended with a disposition to beard established authority, and to trample down prejudices, no less inveterate than excusable. With the apprehensive, but prescient sagacity of age, he also saw a spark in caps and surplices, quite equal to raise a mighty flame[1]. He sought anxiously, therefore, to suppress the clamour against these distinctions, thinking, probably, that national good sense, if calmly left to take its course, would soon reduce them to their true standard of importance.

---

[1] "Controversia nuper de quadratis pileis et superpelliciis inter nos orta, exclamârunt Papistæ, non esse quam profitemur unanimem in religione fidem; sed variis nos opinionibus duci, nec in una sententia stare posse."—Hornus, Episc. Vint. D. Gualtero, Tigur. Eccl. Min. 16. Cal. Aug. 1565. BURNET. *Hist. Ref.* Records. III. 420.

[2] "Does your Lordship thinke, that I care either for cap, tippet, surplis, or wafer-breade, or any such? But for the lawes so establisshed, I esteme them, and not more for exercise of contempt against lawe and authoritie, which I se wil be the end of it: nor for any other respect. If I, you, or any other, named great Papistes, should so favour the Pope, or his religion, that we should pinch Christ's true Gospel, woe be unto us all."—The Archbishop's last letter to the Lord Treasurer. STRYPE. *Parker.* Records. XCIX., iii. 332.

Thomas Young, the northern metropolitan, makes no appearance in the vesture controversy. Hence he may reasonably be considered as unvisited by a deeply-seated scruple about cap and surplice. Had he taken any very serious offence at such distinctions, we must have met with appeals to his authority. Yet he was among the six who resolved upon facing the odium and danger of avowing Protestant opinions, in Queen Mary's first convocation[2]. He fled also for his life, and wore away in exile the tedious years of that mistaken princess's unhappy reign. But he was no partaker of Swiss hospitality, or even a member of that Frankfort congregation, which, at first, listened so readily to Knox. Wesel was his place of refuge, as it was of Scory, bishop of Chichester. The persecuted strangers there were about one hundred, all contented seemingly with King Edward's liturgy; for they never used any other[1]. On Young's return to England, his services and sufferings were requited by the see of St. David's[2]. Archbishop Parker, however, was not long in recommending him for York,—a plain proof of his high estimation of him. He felt satisfied, indeed, of his ability, temper, prudence, and resolution[3]. The court manifested an equal confidence, by appointing him President of the North[4]. His enjoyment of these dignities was rather brief[5]; but he lived quite long enough to abhor cap and surplice, as antichristian and unlawful, if arguments loudly and perseveringly assailing them had been such as his mind could not resist.

---

[1] "I se her majestie is affected princely to governe, and for that I se her, in constancie, almost alone to be offended with the Puritans, whose governance in conclusion, wil undoe her, and al others that depend upon her."—The Archbishop's last letter to the Lord Treasurer. STRYPE. *Parker.* Records. XCIX. iii. 331.

[2] His heart seems to have failed him early in the debate; hence it is, probably, that Foxe suppresses his name. Strype says,—"The queen commanded this convocation to hold a public disputation, at St. Paul's church, concerning the natural presence of Christ in the sacrament of the altar: which, how well it was opposed by four or five of the six (for Young went away), in the presence of abundance of noblemen and others, recourse is to be had to Foxe."—*Cranmer.* i. 461.

Edmund Grindal, bishop of London, had first come into notice as a disputant, at Cambridge, against transubstantiation, in King Edward's reign. Soon afterwards he became chaplain to Bishop Ridley; Rogers and Bradford, eventually martyrs, being his fellows. Under Queen Mary's government, such a man must have been quickly overtaken by a loathsome prison, and an agonising death. Hence he sought safety in flight, and fixed himself at Strasburg. He there signed a letter to the congregation at Frankfort, deprecating departure from Edward's liturgy, as a tacit and pernicious admission of "imperfection and mutability[6]." He was even the bearer of this communication, and was thus personally concerned in that settlement which drove Knox and Whittingham to Geneva. But Grindal, though satisfied with his country's liturgy, was not equally so with her ecclesiastical attire. On his nomination to the see of London, he consulted Peter Martyr as to the lawfulness of using dresses, long holden in superstitious estimation. His letters relating to this, and other questions, were not fully answered until he had been consecrated bishop of London[1]. Thus Grindal stood committed to the habits; and Martyr approved, but recommended him to teach and speak against them. The learned foreigner denied any serious importance to a clergyman's ordinary dress; thus unreservedly surrendering the cap. Ministering vestments he placed upon a different footing, observing that he constantly refused himself, when canon of Christ-church, to wear the surplice. He would not, however, allow scruples upon such subjects as a sufficient ground for withdrawing from useful situations. This operation of them, he represented as necessarily productive of unfit appointments: thus rendering farther concession hopeless[2]. These views were evidently Grindal's own. But unfortunately, an active party paid far more attention to his tongue than his example. Yet, the former did no more than give utterance occasionally to doubt and dislike: the latter spoke habitually a deliberate conviction, that mere externals ought not to disquiet conscience, paralyse utility, or engender separation.

---

[1] STRYPE. *Memorials.* iii. 233.

[2] Consecrated Jan. 21, 1560.—GODWIN. *De Præsul.* 586.

[3] Archbishop Parker to Secretary Cecil. Date, Oct. 12, 1560. Extract. STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 173.

[4] Translated Feb. 20, 1561: made President of the North at the same time.—GODWIN. *De Præsul.* 710.

[5] He died June 26, 1568.—*Ib.*

[6] *Troubles at Frankford.*

James Pilkington, bishop of Durham, one of the Cambridge disputants against transubstantiation, under Edward, and subsequently an exile in Switzerland[3], came home under apprehensions of "unprofitable ceremonies[4]."

---

[1] Dec. 21, 1559. The new bishop was then forty years of age.—STRYPE. *Grindal.* 49.

[2] *Ib.* 44, 45.

[3] He spent part of his time at Zurich, the rest at Basle. He had been master of St. John's College, Cambridge.—STRYPE. *Memorials.* iii. 232, 233.

[4] Extract of a letter from Frankfort, dated Jan. 3, 1559. STRYPE. *Annals.* i. 263.

By way of excusing such as pleaded conscience, in refusing the habits upon such grounds, he paints the inconsistency of rejecting Popery, yet clinging to Popish apparel, "as a holy relic[1]. This is, however, an exaggeration; the obnoxious vestments being retained from policy, not from any thought of intrinsic holiness. But besides a lurking prejudice against them, the bishop highly valued many of their more uncompromising opponents. Hence he willingly gave every advantage to the scruples of these excellent persons, and would fain have procured for them entire satisfaction. His own unbiassed opinion of the controversy evidently was, that it turned upon trifles[2]. On the eve of his return from exile, he had, with others, expressed himself willing to obey orders from authority, "being not of themselves wicked[3];" and his example, indeed, was a standing rebuke to those who acted otherwise. He excuses this by professing an expectation, that conformity was intended to be only temporary[4]; then he flies off, by relating that Bucer would not wear a square cap, "because his head was not square." Thus the objections were treated as merely plausible, whatever indulgence might be due to those who urged them.

---

[2] Bishop Pilkington to the earl of Leicester: date, Oct. 25, 1564. Strype. *Parker.* Append. xxv. iii. 70.

[2] "In this liberty of God's truth, which is taught plainly without offence, in the greatest mysteries of our religion and salvation, I mervel much that this smal controversie for apparel shuld bee so heavily taken. But this is the malice of Satan, that where he cannot overthrow the gretest matters, hee wil raise grete troubles in trifles."—*Id. ad eund. Ib.*

[3] Extract of a letter from Frankfort, *ut supra.*

[4] "Thogh thinges may be bornwith for Christian libertie sake for a tyme, in hope to wynne the weake: yet whan libertie is turned to necessitie, it is evil, and no longer libertie: and that that was for wynning the weak, suffered for a time, is becomen the confirming of the froward in their obstinatenes."—*Id. ad eund. Ib.* 73.

Robert Horne, bishop of Winchester, dean of Durham under Edward, had found an asylum, in Mary's reign, at Frankfort and Zurich. He landed in his native country with such prejudices against the habits as had usually flowed from a residence in Switzerland. But he found these obnoxious distinctions established by law, and an adoption of them indispensable to the possession of preferment. A refusal of this by himself and his friends, would involve, he felt, either the continuance of Popery, or the complete adoption of Lutheranism[1]. He was indisposed even for the latter part of this alternative. Hence he set an example of conformity which he would rather have declined, under an impression that his conduct really compromised no principle of any great importance. He did not cease, however, to feel for those whom conscience bound under a different conviction, and he lived in hope that another parliament would give them some relief[2]. His opinion, therefore, amounts to little more than a needless admission of worth in individuals, while it stamps their scruples as overstrained.

The celebrated Bishop Jewel did not return from his exile at Frankfort and Zurich, without sharing in the sentiments ordinarily brought home. Hence he was among those who doubted, at first, whether conscience would allow submission to established habits and ceremonies[3]. Having determined in the affirmative, he would still have been happy to see them wholly removed and extirpated, for the ease of others more scrupulous[4]. But he is far from taking high ground for their scruples. Peter Martyr had spoken of the vestments as "relics of the Amorites." Jewel compliments this as most felicitous[1]. The view, however, uppermost in his own mind, was the fitness of such attire for stage effect[2]. He founds its attraction upon a long experience of clerical incompetence. Men having seen their pastors mere logs without wit, learning, or morals, at least insisted upon the popular recommendation of a scenic dress[3]. Even now this must not be abandoned from professed anxiety "to follow the golden mean." It ought rather to be called "the leaden mean," Jewel playfully says[4]. As to doctrine, the great apologist admits, nothing more was to be desired[5]. In his opinion, therefore, the whole controversy owed its origin to matters rather below serious notice.

---

[1] "Which was an argument the learned foreigners, their friends, suggested to them."—STRYPE. *Annals*. i. 264.

[2] Rob. Winton. D. Gualtero. date 16 Cal. Aug. 1565. BURNET. *Hist. Ref.* Records. iii. 421.

[3] STRYPE. *Annals*. i. 264.

[4] "Atque utinam aliquando ab imis radicibus auferri et extirpari possint; nostræ quidem nec vices ad eam rem nec voces deerunt."—Jo. Juel. Pet. Mart. date Nov. 5, 1559. BURNET. *Hist. Ref.* Records. LVII. iii. 383.

Edwin Sandys, who filled successively the sees of Worcester, London, and York, was another brief objector to the habits. Being vice-chancellor of Cambridge, at Edward's death, his own Protestant principles, and an application from Northumberland, urged him to preach in support of Lady Jane Grey. In this delicate undertaking he showed so much discretion, that, after a short imprisonment, his friends interfered for him sucessfully[1]. But political amnesty did not involve religious, and he fled, with his wife, to the Continent. His places of exile were Strasburg and Frankfort. When again in England, and marked out for preferment, he was one of those who deliberated upon the statutable attire[2]. Like most of his friends, he decided against any serious importance in the question.

---

[1] "Sunt quidem istæ, ut tu optime scribis, reliquiæ Amoretæorum."—*Id. ad eund. Ib.*

[2] "De religione quod scribis, et *veste scenica.*" (*Ib.*) "Agitur nunc de sacro et *scenico* apparatu, quæque ego tecum aliquando ridens, ea nunc a nescio quibus, nos enim non advocamur in consilium, serio et graviter cogitantur, quasi religio Christiana non possit constare sine pannis."—*Id. ad eund. Ib.* 365.

[3] "Sed illi, quibus ista tantopere placuerunt, credo, secuti sunt inscitiam presbyterorum: quos quoniam nihil aliud videbant esse quam stipites, sine ingenio, sine doctrina, sine moribus, veste saltem comica volebant populo commendari."—*Id. ad eund.* LVII. 383.

[4] "Alii sectantur auream quandam, quæ mihi plumbea potius videtur, mediocritatem."—*Id. ad eund. Ib.* LII. 365.

[5] "Omnia docentur ubique purissime."—*Id. ad eund.* date Nov. 16, 1559. *Ib.* LVIII. 385.

The same opinions were entertained by other prelates, but further particulars are needless. All the bench, however, that returned from exile, had contended long and earnestly, before preferment was accepted, for a complete revolution in ecclesiastical attire[3]. The government shrank from this, as impolitic, being desirous of weaning the people, as it were, imperceptibly, from inveterate superstitions. Hence the *Act of Uniformity* authorised all such habits as were statutably used in the second year of King Edward[4]. Had nothing further been

---

[1] Godwin. *De Præsul.* 711.

[2] Strype. *Annals.* i. 264.

[3] Edm. Grindal. D. Henr. Bullinger. Lond. 27 Aug. 1566. Burnet. *Hist. Ref.* Records. xcii. iii. 472.

[4] Thus particularised in the rubrics to Edward's first book:—"In the saying or singing of mattens and evensong, baptizing and burying, the minister, in parish-churches, and chapels annext to the same, shall use a surplice. And in all cathedral churches and colleges, archdeacons, deans, provosts, masters, prebendaries, and fellows, being graduates, may use in the choir, besides their surplices, such hoods as pertain to their several degrees which they have holden in any university within this realm, but in all other places, every minister shall be at liberty to use any surplice or no. It is also seemly that graduates, when they do preach, should use such hoods as pertaineth to their several degrees.

"And whenever the bishop shall celebrate the holy communion in the church, or execute any other public ministration, he shall have upon him, besides his rochette, a surplice or alb, and a cope or vestment, and also his pastoral staff in his hand, or else borne or holden by his chaplain."

"Upon the day, and at the time appointed for the ministration of the holy communion, the priest provided, a figure, venerable, but somewhat gaudy, would have been presented by the clergy in their eucharistic ministration, though at no other time. A subsequent clause empowered the crown to make new regulations in this case. Elizabeth saw the expediency of resorting immediately to this authority. Her first year did not close, before a commission under the great seal, issued *Injunctions*, which relieved clergymen from the necessity of appearing in communion offices, or on any occasion, otherwise than had been required of them in Edward's fifth year[1]. They were to wear ordinarily an academical dress; in their ministrations a surplice[2]. But even this

---

that shall execute the holy ministry shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say, a white alb plain, with a vestment, or cope. And where there be many priests or deacons, there so many shall be ready to help the priest in the ministration, as shall be requisite. And shall have upon them likewise the vestures appointed for the ministry, that is to say, albs with tunicles." (WHEATLY'S *Rational Illustration.* Oxf. 1819. p. 100. L'ESTRANGE'S *Alliance.* 63, 151.) The cope, with an alb, or surplice, was also to be worn in that portion of the communion service which is used when there is no communion.

[1] "2 *B. of Edw. VI.* And here it is to be noted, that the minister at the time of the communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use neither alb, vestment, nor cope, but being archbishop or bishop, he shall have and wear a rotchet, and being a priest or deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only."—L'ESTRANGE. 63.

[2] "30. *Item.* Her Majesty being desirous to have the prelacy and clergy of this realm to be had as well in outward reverence, as otherwise regarded for the worthiness of their ministries, and thinking it necessary to have them known to the people in all places and assemblies, both in the church and without, and thereby to receive the honour and estimation due to the special messengers and ministers of Almighty God; willeth and commandeth, that all archbishops and bishops, and all other that be called or admitted to preaching or administering of the sacraments, or that be admitted into vocation ecclesiastical, or into any society of learning, in either of the universities, or elsewhere, shall use and wear such seemly habits, garments, and such square caps, as were most commonly and orderly received in the latter year of the reign of King Edward VI.; not thereby meaning to attribute

latter was not exactly Romish, for it had no cross wrought upon the back[1]. Thus, in fact, Protestant prejudices had been largely consulted: quite sufficiently, modern times would generally say. Few would now, indeed, readily see the use even of detailing opinions upon such a subject. But whatever may be its intrinsic value, it was a most important subject, as is testified by many melancholy pages in English history. Nor is its interest merely historical. Square caps and surplices formed a nucleus for Protestant nonconformity. The degree of opposition to them, therefore, offered by leading Protestants, is a matter demanding inquiry. Well-informed nonconformists are naturally prone to seek countenance from these distinguished men. They can hardly deny the original grounds of separation to have been trivial, and illiberal; they would fain believe them to have been very differently

---

any holiness or special worthiness to the said garments, but as St. Paul writeth, *omnia decenter et secundum ordinem fiant. 1 Cor. 14 cap.*" (Queen Elizabeth's *Injunctions.* WILKINS. *Conc. Mag. Brit. et Hib.* iv. 1186. SPARROW's *Collection.* 78.) The clause in Elizabeth's *Act of Uniformity*, authorising the crown to "take this other order," was not inserted in that of Charles II. It was, probably, thought unnecessary to repeat an authority for usages which had legally prevailed during a century.

[1] "It plainly appears, that the habits Queen Elizabeth enjoined were not so properly Popish as Protestant habits; worn in King Edward's time, in the last year of his reign. These habits were a scholar's gown, a square cap, a tippet, or scarf, (to those who were entitled to wear one,) and in the church a white surplice. It should further be considered whether these habits were not effectually distinguished from the Popish garments; 'tis certain they were not consecrated with prayer, crossing, and sprinkling with holy water, as the Popish vestments were. 'Twas only the surplice that could in any sense be called Popish, the other being academical, and even this had not the crucifix and crosses which were embroidered on the Popish garments." (BP. MADOX's *Vindication.* Lond. 1733. p. 90.) Of the vestments prescribed in Edward's first service-book, very full and satisfactory accounts are given in Mr. Palmer's excellent *Antiquities of the English Ritual.* Oxf. 1832. ii. 309.

viewed, not by certain individuals merely, but by all to whom England owes the Reformation.

The most considerable among those who, besides originally taking this view, inflexibly retained it, was Dr. Thomas Sampson, dean of Chichester under Edward, of Christchurch under Elizabeth. Even at his ordination by Archbishop Cranmer, he, with some others, had objected to the habits, and their scruples were indulged[1]. Frankfort found him a refuge in Mary's reign[2]. His principal coadjutor in this unhappy controversy was Dr. Laurence Humphrey, now president of Magdalen College, Oxford: who had been expelled from that house for his Protestant principles, by Bishop Gardiner, soon after Mary's accession[3]. He then withdrew to Zurich, where he found a reception which left an indelible impression upon his mind[4]. Swiss hospitality operated with almost equal strength upon his prejudices: he, therefore, cordially supported Sampson in a steady refusal to wear the dresses imposed by law. Humphrey held with his presidency, the regius-professorship of of divinity[5], and justly bearing a very high character for learning, morals, and ability, his opinion carried great weight. Having, also, that happy temperament which universally conciliates affection, his objections were naturally placed above any suspicion of perverseness[6].

---

[1] STRYPE. *Cranmer.* i. 273.

[2] STRYPE. *Memorials.* iii. 231.

[3] *Ib.* iii. 82.

[4] *Ib.* iii. 232.

[5] He was appointed to the regius-professorship in 1560, and elected president of Magdalen in the following year, after a severe struggle. Having been a fellow of the college, he was recommended for the headship by Abp. Parker, and Bp. Grindal. But the fellows chiefly were prejudiced in favour of Romish principles, and hence were not brought to elect Humphrey without great difficulty.—STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 223.

[6] STRYPE. *Annals.* i. pt. 2. 144.

Sampson and Humphrey have left an authentic record of their sentiments, on the vesture question, in a letter to Bullinger, conjointly signed. The learned Swiss had argued for the habits on civil grounds. His English correspondents consider this reasoning unsound. Usages derived from the enemies of their religion, they contend, could not be adopted without injuring it. Against such apparel, too, they protested, as a revival of abrogated Mosaic ceremonies, and an unsuitable adaptation to the simple ministry of Christ, of that which had served the Popish priesthood for theatric pomp. To that body and its friends they represent this concession as a triumph: occasioning exulting appeals to Otho's Constitutions, and the Pontifical, in proof that Protestants had been glad of dresses borrowed from their adversaries. This concession is lamented also as redolent of monkery, no less than of Popery and Judaism, as savouring of Pharisaical precision; as the first step by which a conceit of sanctity in garments may again creep over men. Bucer is afterwards mentioned as an authority for denying that prescribed apparel agrees with Christian liberty. He wished all such distinctions abolished, mindful of present abuse, anxious for a fuller declaration of detesting Antichrist, for a removal of all dissension among brethren. Such were the reasons why they strove to have every trace of Antichristian superstition buried in eternal oblivion; why they could not agree to the obtrusion of that which does not edify the Church; why they felt unable to join sound doctrine with halting worship; why they would not maim Christ, when he might be entire, pure, and perfect; why they preferred a pattern from reformed brethren, to one from Popish enemies; why they shrank from dishonouring the service of that heavenly leader whom they and their foreign friends equally obeyed, by raising hostile banners, which it was their duty to demolish and detest[1].

Everything from such men as Sampson and Humphrey, must at least be specious. Their objections have but slender chance of winning any higher character in modern times. But ability, aided by perseverance, will command attention from any age. In this case, too, were high moral worth, considerable station, and recent sufferings. Opposition to power and established authority is, besides, always popular. The dean of Christchurch, and the president of Magdalen, became, accordingly, the leaders of a powerful, energetic, and uncompromising party. This must, however, be considered as accidental, neither of these remarkable men, apparently, having ever calculated upon any such distinction, or being likely to desire it. Humphrey's disposition was, indeed, eminently mild and moderate. Sampson showed himself more unbending, but his temper was very different from that of many who continued the resistance that he and his brother-head began.

Many circumstances concurred in spreading the spirit which came so powerfully recommended from Oxford. Of these, one of the purest was the want of a vent for severe and ascetic views of religion. Such are always popular among those to whom the indulgences of wealth are unattainable. Nor, from remorse, temper, enthusiasm, and various incidents, are they without many admirers in every class. While the monastic system continued in active operation, fanatical, stern, envious, and gloomy spirits found every where facilities for a religious development. But all such became uneasy for want of new channels, when conventual penitentiaries had wholly disappeared, begging friars no longer extolled devotional raptures, and ascetic obvervances ceased to disparage a less obtrusive piety. No censure is intended here upon severe, enthusiastic, or ascetic principles, whether Protestant or Romish, nor upon any who favour, without adopting them. Most of those who hold such opinions are sincerely pious, though human infirmity sometimes betrays them into uncharitableness and indiscretion. The latter class aids in diffusing a conviction that real amendment will alone consist with bright prospects for eternity. The mention of all such religionists, in this place, is merely historical: one clue to a long train of events, equally prominent and important.

---

[1] Laur. Humfr. Tho. Sampson. D. Henr. Bullinger. mense Julii, 1566. BURNET. *Hist. Ref.* Records LXXVIII. iii. 433. One clause in this letter speaks of the cope as then in use. *Et copa quæ tum* (*temp. sc. Edv. VI.*) *lege abrogata est, nunc publico decreto restituta est.* The use of this vestment, however, must have been merely optional after the queen's Injunctions were issued. It is a pity, therefore, that the excellent writers mentioned it, as they thus were plainly denying a liberty to others which they insisted upon for themselves.

Opposition to the habits also rested honourably upon an imposing mass of activity, talent, zeal, and moral worth. Many of its partisans had all these recommendations, some had learning too. Not above a third of the clergy were entrusted with licences to preach[1]: among these a considerable section had imbibed anti-vestural antipathies. Very many of the beneficed clergy must have conformed under Edward, and no small proportion under Henry likewise. But nearly all these men were swayed by prejudices essentially Romish. In so large a body there were, of course, ignorant and shallow minds, unequal to decide upon theological questions, and willing to adopt almost any change, rather than surrender a living. But the majority may fairly be considered as under a rational conviction, that innovation had stopped short of any vital question. Still, their partialities were in favour of the system in which they had been bred, and many of them secretly kept it alive among their parishioners[1]. The preaching of such clergymen must have had, at least, a leaning towards those principles which the government was anxious to eradicate. Hence the pulpit was interdicted, and popular obloquy could colourably fasten upon them as unfit and unable to discharge an important part of their function. Meanwhile, the reforming party was indulged extensively with authority to preach, and being quite equal to improve this advantage, it gained rapidly upon public attention[2]. Its prevailing repugnance to the vestures, naturally threw upon them a constant accumulation of popular odium.

---

[1] This appears from the returns to letters of inquiry transmitted by Archbishop Parker, through his province, in 1561. (STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 189.) From a paper drawn up by Sir Francis Knollys, or under his direction, in furtherance of a bill against pluralities and non-residence, this deficiency seems to have continued undiminished, in 1584. "It is sayd, that it is impossible to have so manie preachers as this byll doth require resydent, because there be nine thousand parishes, and but three thousand preachers in the realme." — STRYPE. *Whitgift.* i. 382.

---

[1] SANDERS. *De Schism. Angl.* 292.

[2] "The realm had been extreamly visited, in the year foregoing," (Elizabeth's accession) "with a most dangerous and contagious sickness, which took away almost half the bishops, and occasioned such mortality among the rest of the clergy, that a great part of the parochial churches were without incumbents. The rest of the bishops, twelve deans, as many archdeacons, fifteen masters of colleges and halls, fifty prebendaries of cathedral churches, and about eighty beneficed men were deprived at once for refusing the queen's supremacy. For the filling of which vacant places, though as much care was taken as could be imagined to stock the Church with moderate and conformable men, yet many passed amongst the rest, who either had not hitherto discovered their disaffections, or were connived at in regard of their parts and learning. Private opinions not regarded, nothing was more considered in them than their zeal against Popery, and their abilities in divine and humane studies to make good that zeal."—HEYLIN. *Hist. of the Presbyterians*, 246.

Several reasons, besides, may be discerned for this anti-vestural spirit. Some of the Reformers entertained a boundless abhorrence of Popery; others were, probably, influenced, although unconsciously, by scantiness of income, and insignificance or mediocrity of professional appointment. The pressing dearth of useful, trustworthy ministers had also, soon after the queen's accession, procured ordination for many, recommended by little but Protestant zeal. The hastiness of such admissions was quickly rebuked by cases of incompetence, rashness, and misconduct. So great, however, had been the natural eagerness to secure effective services, that episcopal ordination altogether had been occasionally overlooked[1]. No less a person than William Whittingham, dean of Durham, laboured under this defect[2]. He, and others of the clergy, were admitted ministers by foreign churches, unconnected with episcopacy, an ordination by mere presbyters being, probably, considered rather as irregular, than invalid. Even this degree of authority could not always be pleaded by those who assumed a power to bestow ministerial privileges[3]. Clergymen, however, who drew their sacred character from any novel and questionable solemnity were prepared for indiscriminate objections against all the ancient system.

---

[1] Among other articles of inquiry, transmitted in a circular through his province in 1561, by Archbishop Parker, a return was to be made as to the clergy in the the several archdeaconries, "how many of them be neither priests nor deacons."—STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 188.

[2] STRYPE. *Annals.* iii. 468.

[3] It was objected against Whittingham, that he was "made minister by a few mean and lay persons in a private house at Geneva, without the knowledge or consent of Mr. Calvin, the chief minister there." (*Ib.*) Whittingham was preferred to the deanery of Durham, July 19, 1563. (LE NEVE. 351.) It will subsequently appear, that his ordination was impugned, as not even coming up to the Genevan standard of regularity.

Another advantage to the anti-vestural party lay in its democratic spirit. While feudality retained a vigorous grasp, aspiring feelings in the lowly-born were crushed. But European sovereigns had long nurtured a middle class, rising in their towns, and its influence lightened everywhere the pressure of local tyranny. This weight could not even be diminished without encouraging the buoyant energies of man to mount. Inferior life has often to complain of substantial hardships, unequal impediments, unjust exclusions: a proud plebeian is habitually galled by distinctions that ancestry bestows, assumptions that it feeds. A sanguine temperament sees all these prostrate, and envied objects rise within reach, whenever depression is relaxed. Every disposition to improve such advantages, was unequivocally shown by the Swiss Reformers. Political principles entertained among them, especially at Geneva, displayed a freedom long unknown. Mary of England, with her namesake of Scotland, had exasperated some zealous Protestants into questions upon hereditary right. Scripture, they argued, was against it, as to females generally, and as to all idolaters over an evangelical community[1]. Calvin claimed a power for legislative assemblies to control the crown, under sufficient provocation, branding them with *nefarious perfidy*, when false to those popular liberties which God entrusted to their care[1]. His authority could, undoubtedly, be also pleaded for passive obedience[2]. But

---

[1] Female incapacity for the throne was the leading principle in Knox's *First Blast against the monstrous regiment and empire of women*, and in Goodman's *How superior powers ought to be obeyed of their subjects, and wherein they may lawfully, by God's law, be disobeyed and resisted.* Women, it was maintained, are by the Scriptures placed under subjection to men, and are therefore disqualified for acting as governors over them. Goodman retracted this proposition, but Knox persisted in declaring himself as convinced of its immutability, as he was, in the case of God's curse to Eve (Gen. iii. 16). Elizabeth, "he reckoned to be set up by God's extraordinary providence in behalf of religion:" otherwise, "nature and God's most perfect ordinance repugn to such regi-

---

ment." Accordingly, he represented, that "the extraordinary dispensation of God's great mercy made that lawful unto her, which both nature and God's laws did deny unto all other women besides." He even went so far as to write to the queen herself, in July, 1559, "that it was God's peculiar and extraordinary providence that brought her to the kingdom, and that she was not to plead her right by descent or law." Had Knox published more of his *Blasts*, as he threatened, we learn from Gilby, one of his English friends at Geneva, that he would have maintained, "That no manifest idolater, nor notorious transgressor of God's holy precepts, ought to be promoted to any public regiment, honour, or dignity, in any realm, province, or city, that hath subjected themselves to Jesus Christ, and his blessed evangile."—STRYPE. *Annals*. i. 180.

Goodman's retractation, though full as to other political points, leaves the question untouched as to females of unsound religious principles. He says, "I do protest and confess that good and godly women may lawfully govern whole realms and nations." He had represented the anointing of Queen Mary as unlawful, "it being never appointed to be ministered to any but only priests, kings, and prophets."—*Ib.* 183.

[1] "Nam si qui nunc sunt populares magistratus ad moderandam regum libidinem constituti, (quales olim erant qui Lacedæmoniis regibus oppositi erant Ephori, aut Romanis consulibus Tribuni Plebis, aut Atheniensium senatui Demarchi, et qua etiam forte potestate, ut nunc res habent, funguntur in singulis regnis, Tres Ordines, cum primarios conventus peragunt) adeo illos ferocienti regum licentiæ pro officio intercedere non veto, ut si regibus impotenter grassantibus, et humili plebeculæ insultantibus conniveant, eorum dissimulationem nefaria perfidia non carere affirmem: quia populi libertatem, cujus se Dei ordinatione tutores positos norunt, fraudulenter produnt."—CALVIN. *Inst. Christ. Rel.* l. 4. c. 20. s. 31. Ludg. Bat. 1654. p. 543.

[2] "Nobis autem summopere cavendum, ne illam plenam venerandæ majestatis magistratuum authoritatem, quam Deus gravissimis edictis sanxit, etiamsi apud indignissimos resideat, et qui cum sua nequitia quantum in se eam polluant, spernamus aut violemus." (*Inst. Christ.* l. iv. c. 20. s. 31. p. 543.) An early evasion of this doctrine was found by the French Hugonots, in a pretence that their king was a boy, really oppressed by the Guises: against whom they armed, not against him.—SMEDLEY'S *History of the Reformed Religion in France*, i. 111.

partisans are not long embarrassed by such inconsistencies. Passages agreeable to their interests or passions are made interpreters of all the rest. Beza, who succeeded Calvin, as ecclesiastical superior of Geneva, skilfully improved upon his ambiguous politics. When asked whether inferior authorities in a country are bound by God's appointment to protect the people against every tyrant, whether foreign or domestic, he hesitated, pronouncing the question dangerous, unseasonable, and complicated. What his correspondents thought, is plain; and he pronounces them generally both pious and orthodox in their views of magisterial functions[1]. The conversation of such writers is far bolder and more pungent, and pressure of circumstances, ambition, or envy, secures approving listeners, even on the steps of a throne. Benefit rather than injury flows, undoubtedly, from this general disposition to limit and question power. To Protestant nonconformity it was an invaluable auxiliary; which is all that concerns the present purpose. History merely points at principles to explain events.

Without looking thus beyond caps and surplices, their importance is incomprehensible. Upon them, however, turned a constant succession of acrimonious debates; especially in London, where their enemies abounded[2].

---

[1] "Conclusiones de magistratuum auctoritate vestras, quales ad nos misistis, non dubitamus in genere ut pias et orthodoxas approbare. Tantum conjicere non potuimus, cur in articulo 25, feceritis tyrannorum mentionem. Et in 26, qui videtur inferiores magistratus adversus superiores armare, cogimur ἐπέχειν, non modò quoniam periculosum admodum est, nostris præsertim temporibus, ejusmodi fenestram aperire, veruntamen quia de hac re non simpliciter (sicut res a vobis in hac thesi tractatur) sed ex plurimis et gravissimis circunstantiis videtur omnino dijudicandum."—*Epist. Theol. Theodori Bezæ.* Genev. 1575. p. 153.

[2] STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 300. "Ye know there" (in London) "is most disorder."—Parker to Cecil. *Ib.* 322.

Sound policy has been represented as demanding their surrender[1]. Perhaps, this view might be just, if the national prejudices had been chiefly Protestant. But a majority loved ancient usages, and even regretted Romanism. Hence there was little hope of legislative sanction for farther concessions. A powerful resistance to any such proposition was evidently preparing by the Romish party[2], and some zealous Reformers of moderate principles were averse from opening religious discussions anew, lest ground should be lost rather than gained. Another change might prove, they said, at best, *Lutherano-papistical*[3]. The queen was a known enemy to anti-vestural speculations: her good sense, indeed, was a security against all extreme opinions.

Her subjects laboured under a growing distaste for any such moderation, and religious uniformity seemed more hopeless every day. Some zealots of the Romish party withdrew to the Continent[4], where they laid the foundation of those foreign connexions, always embarrassing, often treasonable, which disgraced their Church, and disquieted their country, during all the remainder of Elizabeth's reign. The great majority of their friends at home rested a dislike of Protestantism upon its discordant spirit[1]. Even the more moderate retainers of Romish prepossessions must have been revolted by connivance at irregularities based upon extreme and insulting views of ancient institutions. Among the clergy, several read prayers at church, and said mass in private houses[2]. Thus there appeared little hope of maintaining the present system, without strictly enforcing the laws for its protection. Upon this course, accordingly, the queen determined.

---

[1] "Had the use of habits and a few ceremonies been left discretionary, both ministers and people had been easy." (*Hist. Pur.* i. 204.) But hear a contemporary as to the reformed clergy of France. "If they had been more grave and more learned, and of better life, or the greatest part of them, they would have had more followers. But they chose at the outset to blame all the ceremonies of the Roman Church, and to administer the sacraments in their fashion, without preserving the moderation which many Protestants observe, as those of England and Germany; who have retained the names of curates, deacons, subdeacons, canons, and deans, *and wore surplices and long robes, which led the people to an honourable reverence.*"—CASTELNAU.

[2] "Speramus certe proximis comitiis, illam decreti partem abrogaturos. Sed si id obtineri non poterit, *quoniam magna ope clam nituntur Papistæ*, ministerio nihilominus divino adhærendum esse judico."—Hornus Ep. Vint. D. Gualter. 16 Cal. Aug. 1565. BURNET. *Hist. Ref.* Records. LXXV. iii. 421.

[3] "Papisticum profecto, vel saltem *Lutherano-papisticum* habebremus ministerium, aut omnino nullum."—Grindal. Ep. Lond. et Horn. Ep. Vint. Bulling. et Gualt. 6 Feb. 1567. *Ib.* LXXXIII. p. 448.

[4] "One of the said unlearned prebendaries" (of Carlisle) "was lately departed; fled abroad per-

A statement, found among Cecil's papers, details existing irregularities. Some clergymen read prayers in the chancel, others, in the nave, some from a reading-desk, others from the pulpit; some adhered strictly to the prescribed service, others interspersed metrical psalms. Communion tables, variously formed and furnished, were transferred to the nave, in some churches, in others, though still in the chancel, they stood not against a wall,

---

haps to Louvain, or some other place, as many of the Papists now did." (1563.)—STRYPE. *Grindal.* 125.

[1] Horn. Ep. Vint. D. Gualt. 16 Cal. Aug. 1565. BURNET. *Hist. Ref.* Records. LXXV. iii. 420.

[2] "Ita tamen ut interim missas secreto domi per eosdem sæpe presbyteros, qui adulterina hæreticorum sacra in templis publice peragebant, aliquando per alios non ita schismate contaminatos, celebrari curarent; sæpe que et mensæ Domini, ac calicis dæmoniorum, hoc est, sacrosanctæ Eucharistæ, et cœnæ Calvinicæ, uno eodemque die, illo luctuoso tempore, participes fierent." (SANDERS. *De Schism. Angl.* 292.) By overlooking such things, Neal very much improved his case. When people, however, were found, and those commonly of some consequence, who heard mass at home, even on days when they received the sacrament at church, it is plain that ultra-Protestantism might reasonably appear undesirable to the government.

but centrically. In administering, some clergymen used a chalice, others a communion cup, others a common cup: some leavened bread, others unleavened. In receiving, some knelt, others stood, others sate. For baptism, the font was used by some, a bason by others: the sign of a cross was made in some cases, in others it was omitted. In this, and all other of their ministrations, there were clergymen who never wore a surplice, others conformed so far as this, but did not wear the cap. Nor was this always of the customary form, even among such as retained it; some wearing it round, others a button cap: others would hear of no compromise, and wore a hat. It was these, probably, who had renounced academicals altogether, and were to be seen only in common clothes[1].

These diversities had long excited uneasiness in the government, and the prelacy had received her majesty's commands to repress them[2]. But the task was far from easy: nor could men readily enter upon it, who both valued many of the dissentients, and had generally themselves imbibed some portion of their scruples. Episcopal connivance, accordingly, seems to have been universal. This naturally gave offence at court, where Protestant variations were impatiently borne, as favourable to the gathering storm of Romish difficulties. Hence the two metropolitans received instructions, in January, to ascertain actual disorders[1], and to concert remedies for them, with the bishops, especially such as were in commission for causes ecclesiastical, and with others having spiritual jurisdiction. The dissentients are disparaged, as a small, conceited body, fond of singularity and innovation. Their principles, however, are treated as likely to prove infectious, unless restrained in time, causing a general disturbance[2]. Preferment was hereafter to be closed, not only against all whose principles were suspected, but also against such as would not formally pledge themselves to conformity. The first intention seems to have been, that the letter should close with an admonition to discretion, as a guard against future inconvenience[3]. But this clause was erased; probably, for fear of such procrastination and connivance in the bishops, as had already been thought injurious. In its place, expedition was enjoined, under a threat of royal interference, to the discredit of the prelacy, and to the injury of those who should come under the lash of authority[4].

---

[1] STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 302. To the eucharistic variations, the venerable biographer says, "He might have added, some with wafers, some with common manchet bread." The paper is dated Feb. 14, 1564. Neal considers it a report prepared for laying before the queen: which is likely enough; though Collier calls it "a remonstrating paper sent up to Secretary Cecil." Its particular object is, however, immaterial, but it is a valuable record of facts.

[2] "Having also received of us heretofore charge for the same purposes."—To the Archbishop of Canterbury, from the Queen's majesty. Jan. 25, 1564. STRYPE. *Parker.* Append. XXIV. iii. 67.

---

[1] "Cause to be truly understand what varieties, novelties, and diversities there are in our clergy, or among our people." (STRYPE. *Parker*. Append. XXIV. iii. 68.) The report, cited in the last paragraph, might have arisen from this order.

[2] "There is crept and brought into the Church, by some few persons, abounding more in their own senses then wisdome would, and delighting in singularities and changes, an open and manifest disorder, and offence to the godly, wise, and obedient persons, by diversitie of opinions, and specially in the external, decent, and leeful rites and ceremonies to bee used in the churches. So as except the same should bee speedily withstand, stayd, and reformed, the inconvenience thereof were like to grow from place to place, as it were by an infection."—*Ib.* 66.

[3] "And yet in the execution hereof, wee require you to use al good discretion, that hereof no trouble grow in the Church."—*Ib.* 69.

[4] "And in the execution hereof, we require you to use all expedition that to such a cause as this is, shall seem necessary: that hereafter we be not occasioned, for lack of your diligence, to provide such further remedy, by some other sharp proceedings, as shal percase

Within two days after this injunction reached Lambeth, Archbishop Parker communicated its contents, in writing, to Grindal, bishop of London, requiring him to act upon them, in his own diocese, and, as provincial dean of Canterbury, to circulate them among his brother-suffragans[1]. Consultations appear to have been then immediately holden among the leading prelates, to frame orders for securing present uniformity, and a declaration for subscription on future admissions to preferment. In March, accordingly, a body of injunctions, with an appended declaration, were duly transmitted for the queen's approval[2]. But Parker was here severely disappointed[3]. Elizabeth herself, probably, saw the policy of avoiding any needless prominence in harassing a body of her subjects, whose loyalty was above suspicion. There were, undoubtedly, persons in her confidence, the earl of Leicester especially, who would not suffer such a view to be overlooked[4]. Hence a formal approval of the Lambeth regulations was found unattainable. Had their tenor been disliked, the

---

not bee easie to bee born by such as shal be disordered: and therewith also wee shal impute to you the cause thereof." (STRYPE. *Parker*. Append. XXIV. iii. 69.) Strype supposes this alteration to have been desired by the queen.

[1] The Archbishop to the Bishop of London. STRYPE. *Parker*. Append. XXVI. iii. 73. The letter is dated from Lambeth, Jan. 30, 1564. It names the 28th as the day on which the "Queen addressed her letters to" him, the archbishop. The royal communication is, however, dated, but not in the regular place, Jan. 25. Perhaps, the former day might be that on which the letter was ordered, the latter, that on which it was actually transmitted.

[2] A rough copy of the *Advertisements* was transmitted for approval from Archbishop Parker to Secretary Cecil, March 3, a fair copy, March 8. The primate wished Cecil to present this, rather than himself, apprehending such an opposition at the council-board as might provoke him into some hasty language.—*Ib.* i. 316.

[3] He said, "It was better not to have begun, unless more were done," and the like.—*Ib.* 317.

[4] Sir Francis Knollys was another powerful friend to the antivestural party.—STRYPE. *Annals*. i. pt. 2. p. 129.

proceedings upon them which quickly followed never would have occurred. Elizabeth, however, withheld her name, on the plea that it was unnecessary, the prelates having already sufficient authority to act as she wished[1]. Their position thus became highly difficult and invidious. It is plain enough that any reluctance to act would have been immediately resented at court, yet all the painful proceedings in which they soon became involved might be colourably represented as chiefly flowing from their own intolerance. They determined upon removing, at least, every plea of ignorance as to their intentions. They lost, accordingly, no time in publishing their injunctions and declaration, under the title of *Advertisements, partly for the due order in the public administration of the holy Sacraments, and partly for the Apparel of all Persons Ecclesiastical.* This publication cites the queen's letter as an authority, her ministers, therefore, could not have disapproved it. No signatures, however, are printed but those of the primate, and of the bishops, Grindal, Cox, Guest, Horne, and Bullingham. The original document appears to have been signed by others besides; but this is immaterial, as it has none but ecclesiastical authority to plead[2].

The *Advertisements* withdrew, at once, all licences to preach throughout the province of Canterbury. This was, probably, occasioned by anti-vestural declamations from the pulpit[3]. No one, without a new licence to preach, was even to expound Scripture, or gloss a homily. Prayers were to be read or sung from a place indicated by the ordinary, who might choose either church or chancel, as room and popular edification should suggest. The parish was to provide a communion-table, standing on a frame, with a covering of carpet, silk, or some other decent substance. Fonts were not to be removed, nor were basons to be used for baptizing, nor were any to vary from the prescribed form in administering that sacrament. In cathedral and collegiate churches, a cope was to be worn by the principal minister officiating at the communion, which was always to be received kneeling. At altar-services, without a communion, the surplice only was to be used, with a hood. Nothing further was required in any parochial ministration, but this was insisted upon. Gowns, tippets, and caps of the prescribed kinds were to be worn by all clergymen abroad: hats being allowed only on journeys. The declaration, which which closes these orders, contains a pledge for their observance.

---

[1] STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 320.

[2] BISHOP SPARROW'S *Collection.* 121. WILK. iv. 247.

[3] Alley, bishop of Exeter, "said he knew one that boasted he had preached seven or eight sermons against the habits." — STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 311.

The queen's interference was almost immediately felt by the clergy. At a visitation holden at St. Sepulchre's, on Snow Hill, John Mullins, archdeacon of London, announced her majesty's charge to the prelacy, and recommended voluntary obedience. His persuasions wrought upon the great majority to give a written pledge that they would adhere to gown, cap, and surplice[1]. So very recent was the royal order, that hardly any present could have been apprised of it, and some were, therefore, likely to be betrayed into a concession, which their own prejudices, and those of their friends, would afterwards make them regret[1]. Hence an observer accounts for this mortifying defection from anti-vestural principles, by attributing Romish, or unclerical habits to many of the subscribers[2]. However just such imputations may be, the archdeacon must have partly owed his success to the sudden conviction of men, thrown off their guard, that he asked nothing really worth a contest.

---

[1] "An hundred and one, all ministers of London, subscribed, and eight only refused; if the account be true, which I transcribe out of the foresaid journal." (STRYPE. *Grindal.* 144.) The journal is by one Earl, rector of St. Mildred's, Bread Street, who was one of these clergymen. He describes the gown prescribed as "a Turkey gown with a falling cape."

The first regular attempt for enforcing uniformity was, accordingly, a total failure. In the afternoon of March 3, the day on which a draught of the *Advertisements* had been transmitted to Cecil, the archbishop, with other commissioners for ecclesiastical affairs, held a session at Lambeth. Sampson and Humphrey, with four of the London ministers, had been cited. All the six declined conformity. Among expedients for overcoming this pertinacity, letters from Bucer and Martyr were produced[3], but in vain. Parker then gave them copies to take away, and consider at their leisure. These came back in five days, the readers remaining unconvinced. The two Oxford heads then earnestly requested leave to return home, complaining of their present expenses, and various discomforts. Their suit being unsuccessful, they repeated it in a long and elegant Latin letter. This laments that

---

[1] The queen's letter seems not to have reached Lambeth before the 28th of January, and Archdeacon Mullins' visitation occurred, apparently, within the month.—STRYPE. *Grindal.* 143.

[2] "But of the subscribers he makes many to be such as had said mass in Queen Mary's days; and such as would not change their custom of old *Pater Noster*, and shaved their faces, and wore long hair: which was accounted ruffian-like in those days, and not suitable to the gravity of a minister."—*Ib.* 144.

[3] "The same, I suppose, that are mentioned in Whitgift's *Defence*, viz., Peter Martyr in his letter to Hooper, and Martin Bucer in his to a Lasco."—STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 323.

woollen and *linen*[1] should set a few in opposition to the many, private men to authority, obscure men to the illustrious. It lays, however, all this infelicity upon conscience, a tender thing, which will not bear touching and straining[2]. In similar language, they addressed their patron, Leicester, who had recommended them to conform, and who seems to have been the means of their nomination to preach at St. Paul's Cross, on the ensuing Easter[3]. They could neither be sufficiently prepared for this duty, it is represented, nor study the vesture question so deeply as they wished, without returning to their own homes at Oxford[4]. But this indulgence was denied, conformity or deprivation being the alternative absolutely placed before them.

Such a choice was proposed, on the 24th of March, to the whole metropolitan clergy. On assembling at Lambeth, before the ecclesiastical commission[5], they saw

---

[1] "Propter lanam et linum."—Sampson and Humphrey to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of London, Winchester, Ely, and Lincoln, the Queen's commissioners ecclesiastical. STRYPE. *Parker.* Append. xxx. iii. 95.

[2] "Quæ nec tangi nec angi debet."—*Ib.* 96.

[3] This appointment offended the queen, who appears to have taken it as a proof of Parker's double dealing. But the archbishop had no wish to encourage Sampson and Humphrey, thinking their pertinacity largely imputable to the delays which came from the interference of powerful friends. He denied, accordingly, any concern with their appointment to preach, or any knowledge of the party to whom they owed it: but having been made, he suggested the expediency of not interfering with it. In their letter to Leicester, they speak of their "promised service of preaching." Hence Strype reasonably supposes that favoured nobleman to have procured them this office.—*Parker.* i. 328.

[4] *Ib.* 326.

[5] The High Commission Court was erected under the act of the queen's first year, which formally recognised the royal supremacy. The crown was empowered by it to exercise this branch of prerogative by means of commissioners appointed under the great seal. They had authority to decide upon all questions coming under spiritual cognizance. "Several temporary commissions had sat under this act with continually aug-

Robert Cole, rector of St. Mary-le-Bow, formerly an anti-vesturist, standing canonically habited. Pointing to him, the bishop's chancellor said, "My masters, and the ministers of London, the council's pleasure is, that ye strictly keep unity of apparel, like to this man. In the church, ye must wear a surplice; the rubrics in the Book of Common Prayer, the queen's majesty's injunctions, and the Articles, ye must inviolably observe. Ye that will subscribe, write *volo:* ye that will not, write *nolo.* Be brief: no words." Mouths, however, were opened immediately; but it was abruptly added, "Peace, peace. Apparitor, call the churches." The city peculiars of Canterbury were then called in order, afterwards the Southwark churches, and lastly those in the London

---

mented powers, before that appointed in 1583, wherein the jurisdiction of this anomalous court almost reached its zenith. It consisted of forty-four commissioners, twelve of whom were bishops, many more privy-councillors, and the rest either clergymen or civilians. This commission, after reciting the acts of supremacy, uniformity, and two others, directs them to inquire, from time to time, as well by the oaths of twelve good and lawful men, as by witnesses, and all other means they can devise, of all offences, contempts, or misdemeanours, done and committed contrary to the tenor of the said several acts and statutes; and also to inquire of all heretical opinions, seditious books, contempts, conspiracies, false rumours, or talks, slanderous words and sayings, &c., contrary to the aforesaid laws. Power is given to any three commissioners, of whom one must be a bishop, to punish all persons absent from church, according to the act of uniformity, or to visit and reform heresies and schisms, according to law, to deprive all beneficed persons holding any doctrine contrary to the Thirty-nine Articles; to punish incests, adulteries, and all offences of the kind; to examine all suspected persons on their oaths, and to punish all who should refuse to appear, or to obey their orders, by spiritual censure, or by discretionary fine or imprisonment; to alter and amend the statutes of colleges, cathedrals, schools, and other foundations, and to tender the oath of supremacy according to act of parliament." (HALLAM'S *Constitutional Hist.* Lond. 1832. i. 272.) The High Commission, having become highly unpopular, was abolished by the 17th Car. I. which repealed the powers granted under Elizabeth, for its formation. —COKE'S *Reports.*

diocese. The chancellor's peremptory language fell upon the auditory like a thunder-clap, but as refusal incurred immediate sequestration, and if prolonged over three months was to bring deprivation, only thirty out of one hundred and forty declined. Some of these retracted before the three months were expired. But compliance cost many severe struggles. Clergymen complained of being killed in their inmost souls, and unable to minister any longer in singleness of heart. Some, who could not be won over to endure the pollution which they saw in the vestures, pined a while under severe poverty, and then took refuge in agriculture, or other secular occupations. It is remarkable that Papists were among the non-subscribers, and these went abroad[1].

Under prospect of impending ruin, the anti-vestural party turned anxiously to Robert Dudley, lately created earl of Leicester. This royal minion was a younger son of the ambitious duke of Northumberland, beheaded in the last reign, and grandson of that crafty lawyer, the instrument of Henry the Seventh's rapacity, politicly sacrificed to popular fury by Henry the Eighth. The queen had known Robert Dudley from her childhood, and she must naturally have felt for such families as had suffered in her sister's time; a favourable impression, heightened in this case by a very fine face and figure[2].

---

[1] Strype. *Grindal.* 146.

[2] “I have known her” (Elizabeth) “from her eighth year better than any man upon earth.” (Verbal communication of Leicester to La Foret, the French ambassador. Von Raumer's *Illustrations.* Lond. 1835. ii. 91.) “He was a very goodly person, and singular well featured, and all his youth well favoured, and of a sweet aspect, but high foreheaded, which, as I should take it, was no discommendation: but towards his latter end, (which, with old men, was but a middle age,) he grew high coloured and red faced; so that the queen in this, had much of her father, for (excepting some of her kindred, and some few that had handsome

Such recommendations won so completely the heart of Elizabeth, that her partiality became unbounded. But Ambrose Dudley, an elder brother, eventually gratified by his father's earldom of Warwick, inherited the chief of the family property[1]. The favourite's finances, therefore, were likely to remind him frequently that he was only a younger son, and such feelings have rendered innumerable services to party politics. Leicester's ostentatious habits, and suspicious character, seemingly disqualified him for the leader of a party essentially ascetic. But the anti-vesturists wanted a patron of his influence, and he disappointed them by no neglect either of religious forms, or pious phraseology[2].

To solicit his interference in behalf of the ministers threatened with deprivation, both Pilkington, the bishop, and Whittingham, the dean of Durham, wrote long and laboured letters. The former urges indulgence in apparel, as necessary to secure even the present insufficient supply of preachers, many being bent upon abandoning function and living, in preference to assuming any appearance of Popery[3]. Whittingham asserts that none are justified in pronouncing the apparel indifferent, until they have proved

---

wits in crooked bodies,) she alwayes took personage in the way of her election, for the people hath it to this day in proverb, *King Harry loved a man*."—Sir Robert Naunton's *Fragmenta Regalia*. Lond. 1641. p. 14.

[1] "This Robert was inheritor of the genius and craft of his father, and Ambrose of the estate."—*Ib.*

[2] "To take in the observations of his letters and writings, (which should best set him off,) for such fell into my hands, I never yet saw a stile of phrase, more seeming religious, and fuller of the strains of devotion, and were they not sincere, I doubt much of his well being." (*Ib.* 15.) He was born in 1532, created first, baron of Denbigh, and afterwards, earl of Leicester, in 1563. Rumour taxed him with murdering his first wife, attempting to poison his second. His brother Ambrose was created earl of Warwick in 1567.—Banks's *Baronage*. iii. 458. Nicolas's *Synopsis*. 369, 678.

[3] Strype. *Parker*. Append. xxv. iii. 70.

its consistency with God's glory and word, with edification and Christian liberty. The policy that erected golden calves in Dan and Bethel, might now, he maintains, restore even the grossest superstitions of Popery[1].

Whatever might be Leicester's disposition, he was restrained by hopes of marrying the queen, from any prominence likely to offend her. Of his mediation, accordingly, as an anti-vesturist, no trace appears, except in the delay of decisive measures. When December came, Sampson and Humphrey had still to complain of a menace only. The archbishop then proposed nine written questions to them, as to the indifference of the prescribed habits, and the lawfulness of prescribing things indifferent. In answer, they expressly admit surplices to be substantially indifferent: of copes, this is not denied in terms, but still they are absolutely reprobated, as being "brought in by Papists, the enemies of God." Clerical distinction, at ordinary times, it is evasively said, should consist in doctrine rather than in dress. The question of prescribing things indifferent, is overlaid by learned verbosity, of which the drift is, that such prescriptions ought not to be enforced[2].

These answers were very carefully considered, and compared in a scholarly manner with all the best authorities, either by the archbishop, or by some one whom he employed. A digest from this mass of learning was then prepared and transmitted to Cecil. This meets objections to the habits, drawn from the silence of Scripture, by remarking that Sunday might be thus desecrated. It maintains that ministerial vestments are older than Popery, and that edification flows from them, as from all church-furniture, and arrangements for public worship.

---

[1] STRYPE. *Parker.* Append. XXVII. 77, 80. [2] *Ib.* i. 329.

It insists upon the scandal given to weak minds, not yet completely weaned from Popery, by disobedience to laws merely prescribing a few decent vestures. It repels the charge of tyranny, denying that conscience is forced by the refusal of unbridled license in things indifferent[1]. Parker also drew up a circumstantial statement of opinions, ranged side by side, entertained by Bucer and a Lasco on this question. In this he shows the former to have admitted no necessity for discarding anything merely because used by Papists. A Lasco's decision is the reverse, but it naturally loses weight under contradiction from a contemporary, every way worthy of equal attention[2].

Bishop Guest, of Rochester, was another labourer in this thorny controversy. He treats the whole matter syllogistically, and contends that anti-vestural conclusions were drawn positively from false or doubtful premises. People generally, he says, whether Protestant or not, merely view the vestures as becoming, and prescribed by law. Refusal of them, he regrets, as a mark of disunion, injurious to reformed opinions[3]; an evil that none could overlook. Hence Nowell, dean of St. Paul's, framed a *Pacification*, as it was called by the archbishop. This admits no impiety in any who conformed merely to satisfy the law, disclaiming all thought of religion or necessity. A second clause expresses a wish, nevertheless, that the habits were abolished, as a security against abuse, a fuller protest against corrupt and superstitious religion, a more ample profession of Christian liberty, and an expedient for ending dissension among brethren. This addition Nowell declared indispensable even for his own signature. But it was not sufficient for Sampson and Humphrey. They cited in Latin, as then usual among scholars, the text upon lawfulness, expediency, and edification[1]. Under this further limitation, they signed Nowell's proposition; intimating plainly enough, that, however abstractedly lawful, they must refuse the vestures as neither expedient, nor edifying[2].

---

[1] STRYPE. *Parker*. i. 334.

[2] *Ib*. 341.

[3] *Ib*. Append. XXXI. iii. 98.

Those who showed such inflexibility were called *Precisians*, by Archbishop Parker[3]. Among people generally, they became known as *Puritans*. This appellation seems to have originated immediately after the *Advertisements* were published, and measures taken for enforcing conformity in London[4]. These acts naturally aroused unbending spirits into regular opposition, and defined a party. For this, as usual, a distinctive appellation was found by its opponents. A corresponding name had been assumed by the Novatians in the third century[5], and was borne by some dissentients from prevailing doctrines in the eleventh and twelfth centuries[1]. Whether the term *Puritan* arose from any alleged resemblance to some one of these ancient sects, is uncertain. It was, however, long displeasing to those who bore it[2], being intended as no concession of superior purity, but only as a charge of needless and factious pretension to it. Religion is always injured by such designations. They split serious men, really very much agreed, into parties that misunderstood and oppose each other. They furnish the ignorant and irreligious with implements for stopping every avenue to deep reflection and substantial piety.

---

[1] 1 Cor. x. 23.

[2] Strype. *Parker*. i. 345.

[3] *Ib.* ii. 40.

[4] "Such as proceeded in their oppositions after these *Advertisements*, had the name of *Puritans;* as men that did profess a greater *purity* in the worship of God, a greater detestation of the ceremonies and corruptions of the Church of Rome, then the rest of their brethren." (Heylin. *Hist. Presb.* 250.) "The English bishops, conceiving themselves empowered by their canons; began to shew their authority in urging the clergy of their dioceses to subscribe to the Liturgie, ceremonies, and discipline of the Church, and such as refused the same were branded with the odious name of *Puritanes*. A name which, in this notion, first began in this year" (1564), "and the grief had not been great if it had ended in the same.—Prophane mouths quickly improved this nick-name, therewith on every occasion to abuse pious people."—Fuller. *Church Hist.* 76.

[5] The Novatians originated in Novatus, an African, maintaining austere principles of piety, which were warmly seconded by Novatian, a clergyman whom he found at Rome. The two formed a severe sect, which would admit no penitent to communion, after a lapse under persecution, or other heinous transgression. Such strictness never wanting admirers, the Novatians, who called themselves *Cathari* (καθαροί), *the Pure*, survived two centuries.—Du Pin. *Eccl. Hist.* i. 145; Labb. et Coss. i. 635.

---

[1] The *Catharists* of those times are generally charged with Manichæism. Others class them, no doubt more correctly in the main, with later opponents of the Papacy. "Nos autem Catholici constanter asserimus, Ecclesiam Christi esse visibilem et quasi manibus palpabilem; et hujus oppositum est hæresis Johannis Huss, et Wickliff, et Catharorum, et Donatistarum, et Begardorum, et Beguinarum."—BANNES. apud *Launoii Epist.* Cant. 1689. p. 561.

[2] "Yet I do not wel understand what you do mean by these Puritans. Because you do use a dark phrase, noting them to hold a *pure* superstition. Till I be further instructed in this, I say, that if Puritans now be noted to be such as do revive the old rotten heresy of Novatus, from whom the old *Καθαροί* did spring, I do not know any in England which do hold that desperate doctrine. But if that be true which a German writer hath published in print thus:—*Novatiani, teste Hieronymo, semper simulant pœnitentiam, et docendi in ecclesia habent passim facultatem. Simulant se benefactis docere, se cœremonias salvas velle, et tamen ex animo oderunt morem pristinæ Ecclesiæ.* If this authority be true, and you do cal this kind of men Puritans, indeed the Church of England is ful of them. Neither is there any state or degree of office in this Church, in which there are not some of these. These do swarm in great numbers, as bees in fair weather: so are they cherished. The Lord reform them, and make them more profitable workmen, or turn them out, and put better in their places. Justly, by this authority, may a number of our churchmen be called Puritans. The Lord purge them, and make them more pure. But unjustly to impose this name on brethren, with whose doctrine and life no man can justly find fault, is to rend the seamless coat of Christ, and to make a schism incurable in the Church, and to lay a stumbling-block to the course of the Gospel. *Et væ homini per quem offendiculum venit.*"—Mr. Sampson to Archbishop Grindal, 9 Nov., 1574. STRYPE. *Parker.* Append. XCIV. iii. 322.

The *Advertisements*, and the resolution to punish non-conformity shown at Lambeth, produced considerable effect. In most places, the habits were declined no longer[1]. This yielding spirit was not, however, universal, nor obviously was it likely to continue, if authority should rest contented with commands and menaces. A year's trial of these gentler methods was, accordingly, succeeded by substantial severity. Sampson and Humphrey were made, very properly, the first examples. The former was intreated by Bishop Grindal, even with tears, to wear occasionally the square cap, at Oxford, in public. But he positively refused[2]. Humphrey's pertinacity could have been no less, for both were placed in confinement, though not in an ordinary prison. Sampson was also ejected from his deanery of Christchurch[3]. The archbishop, however, anxious to lighten this misfortune, interceded for some indulgence for him from that society[1], and for his early restoration to liberty. Subsequently, he became reader of divinity at Whittington College, in London, and master of an hospital at Leicester[2]. The ruling powers, indeed, fully sensible of his merit, were happy to see him provided for and useful in any situation, which would rather veil his defiance of authority. This never was relaxed. Humphrey, at length, gave way. His presidency of Magdalen was not in royal pataonage, but in that of the college, and he retained it. His friend, Bishop Horne of Winchester, soon after he was released from restraint, presented him to a living in the diocese of Salisbury. He would have been glad of this preferment, but being still noted for opposition to the habits, Bishop Jewel refused him institution[1]. Eventually Cecil procured him the deanery of Gloucester, strongly advising his conformity. Humphrey's eye was now cooled by riper age, and it could rest complacently even upon a vesture approved at Rome. He listened, accordingly, to Cecil's advice; and wore, all his latter years, at least while resident as dean, the very dress that he had long denounced as an intolerant remnant of exploded super-

---

[1] "And whereas also the Quene's most excellent Majestie, now a yere past and more, addressed her highness letters enforcing the same charge, the contents whereof I sent unto your Lordship in her name and authoritie, to admonish them to obedience, and so I dowt not but your Lordship have distributed the same unto other of our brethren within this province of Canterburye; *whereuppon hath ensued in the most part of the realm an humble and obedient conformitie.*"—Archbishop Parker to Bishop Grindal. WILK. iv. 251.

[2] STRYPE. *Parker*. i. 368.

[3] Thomas Godwyn, S.T.P., was preferred to the deanery of Christchurch, in June, 1565. (LE NEVE. 231.) Sampson "was, by a special order from the queen, deprived of his deanery by the archbishop and commissioners." But this act did not pass unquestioned by the common lawyers. Bishop Barlow, it seems, having deprived the dean of Wells, under Edward VI., was compelled to sue for pardon from the penalties of *premunire*, because that deanery was a donative. "If it be so," says an ancient anonymous lawyer, "I would fain know by what authority Mr. Thomas Sampson was deprived from the donative deanery of Christ's Church in Oxford, which he had *pro termino vitæ*, under the great seal of England."—STRYPE. *Parker*. i. 368, 371.

---

[1] "By these letters enclosed, your favourable commending of my case to the chapter of Christ-Church, in Oxon, is well witnessed to have had with them just regard." (Dr. Sampson to Archbishop Parker. June 3, 1565.) "I am glad that my letters written in your behalf to the Church took such effect as ye desired. And as ye have not deserved to the same in your government the contrary, to my understanding, so again I have written my letter to obtain your other request: praying you in Christ Jesus to salve against this great offendicle risen by your dissent from the course of the Gospel." (Archbishop Parker to Dr. Sampson. June 4, 1565. STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 372, 374.) The "other request" was the writer's enlargement. Thus the archbishop followed a severity, which he was judicially compelled to exercise, by immediate acts of substantial kindness. Neal, however, contents himself with the following representation of this case. "The storm chiefly fell upon Sampson, who was detained in prison a considerable time, as a terror to others; and by special order from the queen, was deprived of his deanery; nor could he ever obtain, after this, any higher preferment in the Church, than the government of a poor hospital." (*Hist. Pur.* i. 85.) Upon this passage, the editor, Toulmin, fairly remarks in a note:—"Mr. Neal appears not to have known, that Mr. Sampson was also appointed prebendary of St. Paul's cathedral, and was permitted by the queen to be a theological lecturer in Whittingdon College, in London." Sampson, undoubtedly, appears to have been considered poor, in his latter days, among the affluent; for Grindal, when archbishop of York, expressed regret upon this very ground. But the deprived dean denies all remembrance of having himself ever complained of poverty; adding, "If I did, I was to blame, for I complained before I had need." (Mr. Sampson to Archbishop Grindal. 9 Nov., 1574. STRYPE. *Parker.* Append. XCIV. iii. 322.) Though far less than it might have been, his professional income, to the end of life, there can be no question, equalled that of many men, nowise behind him in any solid qualification. But neither accident nor design pushed these worthy persons to the head of a party. Hence, their names are lost.

[2] "Though he were put out of the deanery of Christ's-church, yet he was allowed to officiate in another place without conformity. For I find him, *anno* 1573, (but how long before I know not,) master of an hospital in London, called Whittington College; where he read a lecture every term, for the yearly stipend of ten pounds, given him by the company of clothworkers." This stipend was

---

then a reputable maintenance, being equal to a large proportion of the more tolerable livings. With it, Sampson appears to have holden the hospital at Leicester, until he became incurably lame from an attack of *hemiplegia*, towards the close of 1573. He then "retired to the hospital at Leicester, where he lived a great time after."—STRYPE. *Annals*. i. pt. 2. p. 150.

[1] The bishop urged from St. Paul, that "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace." (1 Cor. xiv. 33.) Humphrey, by letter from Oxford, dated Dec. 20, 1565, denied the applicability of this text to his case. He said, also, "that the man that then served the cure, he heard, was conformable enough, and that he himself, when he preached, should not transgress. That, therefore, if he offended not in his diocese, he trusted the bishop would not be offended out of his diocese." (STRYPE. *Parker*. i. 370.) This amounts to a pledge of occasional conformity. But it did not satisfy Jewel; and he wrote, accordingly, to Archbishop Parker, Dec. 22, 1565,—"That in respect of his vain contention about apparel, he thought best to make a stay, till he understood his grace's pleasure: and that unless he should otherwise advise him by his letter, he minded not in anywise to receive him: adding, that his long sufferance bred great offence."—*Annals*. i. pt. 2. p. 183.

stition[1]. The same rebuke to earlier scruples was ultimately given by Whittingham, dean of Durham, though identified completely with Geneva, and conspicuous for irregularity of ordination[2].

One of the first and most abrupt examples of this rebuke came from George Withers, a learned and popular preacher, at Bury, in Suffolk. He had shown himself a zealot against Popery, in some intemperate remarks upon the painted windows at Cambridge. A counsellor of mischief seldom pleads in vain, especially where there is a large infusion of young blood in his auditory. Withers, accordingly, had the satisfaction of seeing his invectives quickly bring destruction to many fragile, but beautiful specimens of ancient art. It required, indeed, active interference from men of cooler heads, or more tasteful eyes, to stay this warfare against pellucid imagery[3]. The prejudice to which Cambridge owed such lamentable mutilation, could never spare cap or surplice. Hence Withers laboured assiduously to impress his ordinary congregation with an insurmountable abhorrence of these reprobated habiliments. Popular talents thus directed, gained him an early summons before the ecclesiastical commission at Lambeth, to answer for his nonconformity. Refusing concession there in a bold and senatorial tone, he was suspended[1].

---

[1] In acknowledging Cecil's kind patronage, he says,—"That he was loath her majesty, or any other honourable person, should think that he was forgetful of his duty, or so far off from obedience, but that he would submit himself to those orders in that place where his being and living was. And therefore he had yielded." (STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. pt. 2, p. 65.) Humphrey was installed dean of Gloucester, Mar. 13, 1570. In 1580, he was removed to the deanery of Winchester.—LE NEVE. 103.

[2] "Yet this Whittingham afterwards wore the habits required; and when one of his Geneva fellow-exiles had reproached him for so doing, he justified himself by Calvin's judgment, whom he and others had heard say,—*That for external matters of order, they might not neglect and leave their ministry: which would be for tithing mint to neglect the weightier things of the law.*"—STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 313.

[3] STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 382. It does not certainly appear that Withers caused this mischief from the university pulpit. This is, however, most likely.

He thought himself, probably, quite above any such mischance, although armed with a defence pressed rather inconsistently into puritanical service. When asked for his authority to preach, he pleaded a license originating in papal authority, from the university of Cambridge. Alexander VI., while Bishop Fisher was chancellor, granted to that learned body the privilege of commissioning twelve graduates to preach in any part of the British Isles, without waiting for episcopal concurrence. The discontented party now gladly availed itself of this ingress to the pulpit, in spite of its derivation from a quarter habitually assailed by unqualified abhorrence. The archbishop seems to have been exceedingly annoyed by the plea set up. He was too fond of Cambridge, and too careful of interference with established rights, for a direct attack upon the privilege itself. He, therefore, fixed upon an informality in the license. Properly, such an instrument ought to have had the chancellor's sanction. The one produced by Withers wanted this authentication, and was hence represented as void. Parker then endeavoured to arouse the jealousy of Cecil, the chancellor, upon this omission. But he seems to have gone no further in resisting the authority, than resolving to suffer no Cambridge license, without the chancellor's name, to protect any preacher in his own diocese[2].

When Withers returned in disgrace to Bury, he found his eloquence to have produced a flash, instead of a flame. The congregation, unwilling above measure to be deprived of his ministry, assured him that he might wear a corner-cap without losing a particle of their esteem. Some of them seem even to have reckoned upon his compliance, before he departed for London. They had made bargains, on condition of payment, when their valued minister should again preach among them[1]. Thus Withers had no sooner arrived at home, than he was assailed by diversified importunities to retract his refusal. He readily yielded, nor did many days elapse before the archbishop was informed by letter, that he would "somewhat strain his conscience, and wear the cornered cap[2]."

---

[1] "Withers appeared *cum magna confidentia, vultu senatorio,* as the archbishop expressed it to the secretary." — STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 383.

[2] Parker to Cecil.—*Ib.* i. 384.

Intemperate language, however, often does a mischief that no subsequent moderation in the speaker can repair. Thus Withers could kindle a flame, at Cambridge, upon which even his own example afterwards had no effect. His vestural antipathies were, indeed, cordially and effectively espoused by a youthful preacher there, named Fulk[3]. A body comprising comparatively few individuals in middle life, and chiefly made-up of mere lads, was naturally delighted with energetic harangues, discrediting authority, and insisting upon change. Hence Cambridge became widely pervaded by prejudices against cap and surplice, justly branded by cooler contemporaries, as *fanatical*[1]. The seniors generally were uninfected by this "lewd leprosy of libertines," to use the words of Cecil, but they were apprehensive that attempts to check it would be ruinous or vain. When confident rumour, accordingly, announced a royal proclamation to enforce conformity, four heads of houses, and the Margaret professor, intreated Cecil, as their chancellor, to save the university from a measure so likely to render its colleges grievously deserted[2]. One of these five, it is true, Longworth, master of St. John's, though a conformist, had imbibed innovating principles. This bias was rendered soon after undeniable, by his departure from college, seemingly on purpose, when some festival was at hand. All the members of his house, whom he reckoned at three hundred, then appeared, according to his report, in chapel, without surplice or hood, and some alterations were made in administering the Sacrament. Longworth soon returned, but his college did not resume the surplice.

---

[1] "In a journey he took to Ipswich, taking Bury in his way, he gave them two sermons, which he did, as he said, so much the rather, for that divers of his friends were greatly endangered by bargains which they sold, provoked by the brags of adversaries, to be paid when he preached again in Bury."—STRYPE. *Parker*. 395.

[2] In his letter, dated May 24, he says, "I was afraid to have been an offence unto the godly, considering the wo pronounced upon them by whom offences come: but seeing my departure should more offend them, than the wearing any apparel, and also more rejoice the enemy, I will rather strain my conscience somewhat, than altogether to discourage the godly, or to let the wicked have their minds."—*Ib*. 375.

[3] "I do now also send a special commandment to a young preachar called Fulkes." (Cecil to the Vice-chancellor of Cambridge. STRYPE. *Parker*. Append. XLI. iii. 130.) In the body of his work, (i. 387,) Strype calls this young man Fulk, which most likely, was the correct form of his name, sibilant additions being generally vulgar corruptions, where names are often written without such.

---

[1] "De fanaticis nostris *superpellicianis* et *galerianis*." (Clerk to Cecil. STRYPE. *Parker*. Append. XLIII. iii. 134.) This letter contains the well-known story of a young man who excused the want of his surplice by alleging a scruple of conscience, but who was found to have pawned it to the cook, as security for a debt. Cecil also talks, in his letter to the vice-chancellor, of "fanatical devises."

[2] "Cum nobiscum ipsi quotidie recordamur, quanta sit apud nos et piorum et eruditorum multitudo, qui testimonio conscientiæ usum omnem ornatus hujusmodi sibi illegitimum ducant, et quorum discessu, si vis edicti urgeat, omnino est periculum, ne Academia nostra orba fuerit."—Dr. Beaumont, &c., to Cecil. Nov. 26, 1565. STRYPE. *Parker*. Append. XXXIX. iii. 125.

The queen heard of these liberties with a disgust, in which Cecil shared. Vain were intreaties from the Johnian innovators, to be excused from wearing surplices hereafter, which, they said, would be again forcing their consciences under a very bitter yoke of slavery[1]. The court would hear nothing of such scruples, and Longworth was driven to confess formally his late connivance, pledging himself to repress future irregularities[2]. This timely interposition gave the rising spirit a salutary check: it was too deeply-rooted for extinction.

The queen, however, seems to have considered its prevalence partly owing to supineness in the hierarchy. She sent, accordingly, for Archbishop Parker, and charged him to suffer nonconformity no longer[3]. He lost no time in communicating her pleasure to Bishop Grindal, who thus felt himself driven upon severities most painful to his feelings[1]. The two prelates opened a court in the chapel of Lambeth House, on the 26th of March, and before them were summoned the clergy of London. Being naturally anxious to lighten their distressing and invidious duty, they pressed for the co-operation of some distinguished laymen. This appeared so reasonable, that Elizabeth allowed Parker to reckon upon seeing Cecil, the Lord-Keeper Bacon, and William Parr, marquess of Northampton[2]. But not one of them attended: hence all the odium of measures, really originating at court, fell upon the prelacy. Earnest endeavours were used for bringing the assembled clergy to conformity, and in sixty-one cases, with success. Thirty-seven of the party refused, and were placed, within two days, under suspension and sequestration. Contumacy for three months further was to be visited by deprivation[3].

---

[1] "Acerbissimum illud conscientiæ servitutis jugum." — St. John's College to Cecil. STRYPE. *Parker*. i. 390.

[2] Longworth's submission, dated Dec. 14, 1565, is printed at length in Strype's *Parker*. (Append. XLIII. iii. 133.) The master's statement of transactions in his absence, is, probably, lost, but Cecil's letter to the vice-chancellor (*Ib.* XLI. p. 128,) unreservedly charges it with exaggeration, at the very least. This letter also says, "I am recomforted, in that I see the elders and fathers of that universitie, with others of approved lerning and godlyness, remayne untouched by this leud leprosy of libertines; and most of al to understand, that among so many societies in colleges, none that have bene stablished in orders have thus riotously shaken off the yoke of obedience and ordre, but onely one." These Cambridge transactions were, undoubtedly, important in their consequences: Neal improves their appearance, by taking no notice of Longworth's exaggeration, or of the discountenance shown them among the seniors generally. Of course, this discountenance was not quite universal, for Parker advises Cecil by letter, not to "suffer so much authority to be borne under foot by a bragging, brainless head or two."—*Ib.* i. 389.

[3] "Being, therefore, cauled to her presence to see her lawes executid, and good orders decreed and observed." — The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishop of London. March 28, 1566. WILK. iv. 251.

This decisive blow occasioned a great outcry in London. Suspension and sequestration fell upon some of the most popular preachers, whose congregations were highly discontented and exasperated. Parker and Grindal made such provision as they could, for supplying the pulpits deprived of their usual occupants. But several churches were necessarily closed for a time, and this deficiency was rendered more painfully conspicuous by the quick arrival of Easter; when there was usually a large attendance to receive the Sacrament. Considerable numbers assembled for this purpose, were disappointed; in some cases, from the wilfulness of churchwardens, who would provide neither surplice nor wafer bread[1]. Thus were deeply sown the seeds of an acrimonious hostility to the hierarchy, and established religion. London became widely pervaded by a sullen dissatisfaction, and an appetite for change, equally certain to find a succession of fresh objects, and to roam over all the country.

---

[1] "The Puritan party confided much in him," (Grindal) "and gave out that my lord of London was their own."—STRYPE. *Grindal.* 155.

[2] "The secretary gave the archbishop notice, that, according to his desire, and the queen's promise, the lord-keeper, and the lord marquess of Northampton, and himself intended to be present. But the archbishop desiring to be certain, whether they would come or no, as laying great stress upon the presence of some great persons, sent a message on purpose to the secretary, minding, if they would come, to invite them to dinner. Or if they came, he intended to have more assistance with himself and the bishop of London. And indeed they came not, detained either by weightier matters, or their own unwillingness." (STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 429.) Northampton, brother to Queen Catharine Parr, was restored to his honours, lost as a partisan of Lady Jane Grey, in 1559. He died in 1571.—BANKS's *Baronage.* iii. 595.

[3] STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 429.

Silence being now imposed upon the pulpits long noted for invectives against cap and surplice[2], rather than for more profitable subjects, the sequestered preachers sought refuge in the press. They soon published a pamphlet explanatory of their views in refusing the apparel prescribed by law. They maintain as a foundation of their argument, that "all things in the Church ought to edify." The apparel, they assert, contradicts this principle, being a hindrance to the simple, a corroborative to Popish obstinacy, and a monument of idolatry. It is, besides, treated as a precept of men, therefore to be declined; offensive and superstitious, therefore to be avoided. Princely pleasure is pronounced immaterial in religious affairs, having no power to authorize anything besides Scripture, or contrary to it; and the contested regulations are placed under both objections. Our Saviour, it is argued, purchased a liberty which ought to be maintained, but which this apparel infringes, having been borrowed both from Jews and Gentiles. It is also denounced as having been abused to idolatry, sorcery, conjuring; and as being viewed under most objectionable aspects, by both Papists and Gospellers, the former considering it holy, the latter unlawful[1].

---

[1] STRYPE. *Grindal.* 155.

[2] "This I am sure of, that the homilies appointed to be read in the churche, are learned, godly, agreable to God's worde, and more effectuall to edification, than a number of your sermons, which consiste in words only, and entreate of little else but of cappe, surplesse, &c.; archbishop, lorde bishop, &c.; the ende whereof is not edification, but contention."—WHITGIFT'S *Defense of the Aunswere to the Admonition against the Replie of T. C.* Lond. 1574. p. 296.

This piece received an early answer, in a spirited, well-written pamphlet, occasionally caustic, though not violent. At the end of it are translations of Peter Martyr's letter to Bishop Hooper, and of Bucer's to John a Lasco, showing the disposition of these venerated reformers to concede such points as cap and surplice. Existing opposition to them is treated as very rare in persons really worthy of attention; being chiefly found in such as had originally followed secular vocations, and hence were scantily supplied with professional knowledge, or in such as were notorious for overweening self-sufficiency[2]. This charge seems to have been made upon plausible grounds, at least; for in an answer, which quickly appeared, it is denied in a tone ordinarily betraying soreness[1]. The answerer imputes no positive iniquity to reception of the vestures, but condemns it as an admission of antichristian leaven, therefore a breach of St. Paul's injunction, "Abstain from all appearance of evil[2]." He denies any authority to order such things in religion as do not edify, and pronounces the points in dispute to have lost their natural character of indifferency,

---

[1] Scheme of the arguments in the *Declaration of the London Ministers*, prefixed to *A briefe Examination for the tyme of a certain Declaration, &c.*

[2] "They be but a very fewe in themselves, other than such as have been eyther unlernedly brought up, most in prophane occupations, or suche as be puffed up in an arrogancie of themselves, peradventure chargeable to such vanities of assertions as at this time I will spare to charge them." —*A briefe Examination for the tyme of a certain Declaration lately put in print in the name and defence of certaine Ministers in London, refusing to weare the apparell prescribed by the lawes and orders of the Realme.* "Imprinted at London, in Powles' Churchyard, by Richard Jugge, Printer to the Queene's Majestie. *Cum privilegio Regiæ Majestatis.*" There is no date. The author, perhaps, was not known; for the reply, remarking upon some of his severe language, says, "Wee might perchaunce turne it against the ex-

---

aminar, if wee knew him, wich although we do not, yet wee may be bold to put him in mynd of the counsell of Christ, *Nolite judicare*," &c.

[1] "If yow, with all the lerned of your side, wold procure us a free and a general disputacion, to have the matter quietly debated and indifferentlie judged, yow shold se a great nomber redie to defende our cause with their tongs whom yow now blot out with your penn: for it is well known that not onelie a few unlerned, brought up in prophane occupations, as yow slanderuslie report, but a gret nomber of wise, godlie, and lerned men, such as have bene and are the eldest preachers, nevar stayned with any recantacion or subscription, brought upp in all kinds of lerning, both of artes and toungs, such as have the name not onelie at home, but also in forraine nations, to be of the nomber of the best lerned in the realm, agree with us in this cause, and of them partly have wee lerned this judgement."

"To be called from an occupation to the mynisterie of the church, is no more reproch nowe to men mete for that function, then it was to Petar, Paull, and the rest of the apostles. If they were unmete, then the bishopes are to be blamed for admitting them, and most of all for retayning and daylie multiplying others, whom nothing ells but a capp and a surples do make commendable."

"And yet, if yow had the spirit of meake Moses, yow wold rejoice in the nomber of the prophets, and if yow were obedient to Christ, or had pitefull bowells toward the nedie people, yow wold pray the lord of the harvest to thrust out moe workmen into his harvest, and not thrust anye out of yt for such tradicions." (*An Answere for the Tyme to the Examination put in print without the Authour's name, pretending to mayntayne the apparell prescribed, against the Declaration of the Mynisters of London*, 1566.) It answers the *Examination* sentence by sentence.

[2] "No man, to our knowledge, condemns the things, nor the users of them, of wickedness."

"Whether it be contrary to the doctrine which yow have lerned to abstaine from all shewe of evill, when yow have lerned that the leven of Antichrist is evill."—*Ib.*

from the abuses to which they had been made subservient[1]. He freely admits, however, the good intentions of those who decided upon retaining them, and also the great preponderance of Romish prejudice among clergymen[2]. Yet the latter admission suggests no concession of expediency to existing regulations, only complains that conformity should secure a benefice, its opposite forfeit one: an alternative rendered more invidious by insinuations, disparaging conformists, extolling dissentients[3]. Martyr and Bucer's authority is hastily dismissed as irrelevant, from its alleged bearing upon a purpose merely temporary[4].

[1] "The ceremonies and apparell tend not to edification but destruction, for that no man by them is directed to Christ, and to the sinceritie of the Gospell, neyther yet provoked to amendment of lyfe, but to Antichrist, and the remembraunce of poperie."

"A good pastor shold admit nothing but that wich he is perswaded will edifie."

"As they are monumentes of idolatrie, and stombling blockes to the weake, they are not to be receaved, though all the princes in the world command them."

"Neyther the magistrat nor the church hath any power but to edifie."

"Wee never graunt these things in respect of all circumstances, to be indifferent."—*An Answere, &c.*

[2] "Wee deni not but that they are reteynid of a good intent, but wee see that an evill end doth follow of the restoring of them, namelie, the popish priestes, who are the greter nomber of the clergie, use them for the same end they did in poperie. And the ignorant people can conceve no other thing of them, but that the servis of God hath grete nede of them. Therefore, for both the uses these are not indifferent, giving manifest offence to the weake, open incouragement to the enemye and ignorant."—*Ib.*

[3] "But nowe experience teacheth that an asse, a dissembling papist, a dronkard, a Swerer, a Gamester, so he receave your apparell, may have the honor of retayning his lyving: but *qui optime præsunt*, they that rule never so well, and are commendable in all poinctes that S. Paule requireth in a perfecte good mynister, for onely refusing the apparell, are thruste out as men unworthy of any honor dewe to a mynister of Christ."

"Now wee see that garmentes are made greter matters than puritie of hart, or bodye either. For papists and dronkards are not deprived if they recyve the garmentes."—*Ib.*

[4] "To the epistles of Bucer and Martir wee aunswere, that what-

English endeavours to still the vestural controversy appearing hopeless, an appeal was made to Bullinger by Sampson and Humphrey. His answer was an elaborate letter, which he communicated to Grindal, in favour of conformity[1]. This the bishop immediately published, and it overcame the scruples of many wavering minds[2]. The nonconformists naturally were disappointed, while the writer complained of publication where the eye of private friendship had alone been contemplated[3]. In the end, Bullinger and Gualter, after declining further interference, united in a letter to Francis Russell, earl of Bedford, imploring him to use his influence for the removal of every Popish relic[4]. Their meaning was obvious, but no such application had any prospect of success, the controversy taking every day a wider basis. Hitherto little had been heard-of beyond cap and surplice: in fact, no further concession had been demanded[5]. But objections originally urged against some parts of the ritual[6], and after-

---

soevar to them seemed tollerable for a tyme, is not to be inforced as a perpetuall lawe. Their epistles and censures to the contrary are to be shewd."—*An Answere, &c.*

[1] Heinr. Bullinger. Ornatiss. D. Laur. Humfr. et D. Th. Samps. Cal. Maij, 1566.—BURNET. *Hist. Ref.* Records. LXXVII. iii. 425.

[2] Edm. Lond. et Rob. Wint. Heinr. Bulling. et Rod. Gualt. 6 Feb. 1567.—*Ib.* LXXXIII. p. 446.

[3] Heinr. Bulling. et Rod. Gualt. Revv. in Christo PP. D. Edm. Grynd. Lond. et Rob. Horn. Wint. Epp. Sept. 6, 1566.—*Ib.* LXXXII. p. 443. Iid. D. Laur. Humfr. et D. Th. Samps. Sept. 10, 1566.—*Ib.* LXXX. p. 440.

[4] Heinr. Bulling. suo et Gualt. nom. D. Laur. Humfr. et. D. Th. Samps. Sept. 10, 1566. Iid. D. Franc. Russ. Com. Bedf. Sept. 11, 1566,—*Ib.* LXXXI. p. 442.

[5] "Propter rem vestiariam, *quæ jam sola controversia ac causa contentionis apud nos fuerat.*"—(Edm. Lond. et Rob. Wint. Heinr. Bulling. et Rod. Gualt. Feb. 6, 1567.) "T. C. The cappe, the surplis, and tippet, are not the greatest matters we strive for."—Whitg. "Yet in the beginning suche was your pretence: neyther was there anyething else that you contended-for: as it is well knowne to all men that had to deale with you, or heard of you."—WHITGIFT. *Defense.* 256.

[6] Sandys, bishop of Worcester, moved convocation, in 1562, to address the queen, for disallowing

wards generally kept out of sight, were again brought prominently forward[1]. Hence, manifestly, one concession must have been immediately succeeded by clamours for another. If therefore, Romish, Edwardian, and Lutheran prepossessions in favour of the vestures had been overlooked, yet Puritanism was not likely to rest contented. Its aim was a total subversion of the religious polity and usages which England dated from her conversion, had interwoven with all her institutions, and to which most of her sons were cordially attached. Nor is it reasonable

---

private baptism by women, and crossing the infant on the forehead. In the same convocation an attempt was made by Nowell, dean of St. Paul's, Sampson, and others, to procure the abrogation of these things, together with that of organs, "curious singing," the necessity of kneeling at the communion, and "all saints' feasts, and holidays, bearing the name of a creature."—STRYPE. *Annals.* i. 501.

[1] "Summa sententiæ nostræ erat, ecclesias Christi sanguine redemptas minime esse deserendas propter pileos et vestes, res indifferentes, cum non propter cultum ullum, sed propter ornatum politice usurpari jubeantur. Nunc vero audimus, (utinam rumore falso,) requiri a ministris novis quibusdam subscribant articulis, aut statione sua cedant. Articulos vero esse hujusmodi, cantum in templis figuratum, et peregrina lingua, una cum strepitu organorum esse retinendum, mulieres in casu necessitatis privatim posse et debere baptizare infantulos. Baptizantes item ministros usurpare exufflationes, exorcismos, crucis characterem, oleum, sputum, lutum, accensos cæreos, et hujus generis alia: docendum esse ministris in perceptione Cœnæ Domini opus esse genuflexione (quæ speciem habet adorationis) nec panem frangendum esse communiter, sed cuilibet communicaturo crustulam ori ejus esse inserendam esse a ministro. Neque vero modum spiritualis manducationis, et præsentiæ corporis Christi in Sacra Cœna explicandum, sed relinquendum in medio." (Heinr. Bulling. et Rod. Gualt. Revv. in Chr. PP. Edm. Lond. et Rob. Wint. Sept. 6, 1566. BURNET. *Hist. Ref.* Records, LXXXII. iii. 444.) This report, though exaggerated, shows that Puritanism had now gone far beyond cap and surplice. The tract, accordingly, already used, published this year, says, "Cope, surplese, starch-bread, (wafers,) gospelers, pistlers, kneling at communion, crossing at Baptisme, Baptisme of women, Cap, tippet, and gowne. *Item:* by authoritie of parliament, albes, alters, vestments, &c., these few things are more then may well be borne with."—*An Answere for the Tyme.*

to suppose that less extensive demands would have followed upon a partial surrender at an earlier time. Principles, taking at first a wider sweep, and then assuming an opportune contraction, were not of a nature for ultimate subsidence within anything short of their original dimensions.

But although there was really no hope of strangling Puritanism at its birth, yet means were not judiciously chosen even for circumscribing its growth. Reason demanded a full exposition of the national difficulties in dealing with a vast mass of prejudice essentially Romish, and a fair allowance for the inveteracy of such prepossessions. But this rational and liberal course is little found in arguments against vestural antipathies. It is true that policy is pleaded for retaining the habits, and that violent reflections upon Popery do not originate with reasoners in their favour. The causes, however, which rendered further innovation impolitic, are passed over with little or no explanation, and Puritanical violence against Popery is rather encouraged than rebuked. Authority is the main ground alleged for the vestures[1].

---

[1] "If to weare a surplisse were an offence to the weake, or if there were not manyfest groundes in Scripture, (suche I meane as commaunde obedience to superioures,) to prove the wearing of the surplisse to be lawfull, then it were something that you saye. But seeing suche only be offended therewith as account themselves moste strong, and condemne other of infirmitie; seeing also that obedience to magistrates in such indifferent things, hath manyfest groundes in Scripture, and to doubt of obedience in suche matters, is in effect, to plucke the magistrate his sworde out of his hande, this reason hath not so muche as any similitude of probabilitie in it. Is there any minister of the Churche (for of suche onely is the surplisse required) that will rather be moved to weare a surplisse by the example of an other, than by the consideration of his duetie towards the lawe, and order of the Churche, by due authoritie in a lawfull and indifferent thing appoynted? You might make the same reason serve to plucke downe the Churches, the

Their essential indifference being admitted on both sides, the prince, it was pleaded, is fully justified in imposing them upon politic grounds. Then comments upon disobedience are never spared, and the whole argument might be colourably represented as framed for little else than maintaining the royal prerogative. Nothing could be more unfortunate for qualifying that nascent spirit of democracy which unconsciously tempted many minds into Puritanical speculations. The whole difficulty might be laid, with seeming justice, upon incurable Popish prejudices in the queen and her courtiers, which they were determined upon maintaining with a high hand, among a people daily becoming more enlightened than themselves. This has ever been the view taken by dissenters, in spite of encouragement given to Puritanism by Leicester, and others most in Elizabeth's confidence. The early prevalence of such a notion must necessarily have exasperated Puritanical prejudice, and rendered it an effective instrument for the eventual formation of a political party.

This evil was expedited by injudicious conduct in the government, as well as in its advocates. Pulpits could resound no longer with invectives against vestures. But even in that age printing might keep the controversy raging. The press, accordingly, both at home and abroad, was actively employed by the silenced ministers. The first gatherings of this literary storm were watched with uneasiness by the ecclesiastical commissioners, and they recommended immediate interference. A royal prohibition soon appeared against all publications attacking any of the national statutes or laws, or any of the

---

Pulpit, the Belles, yea to overthrowe all orders, and all lawes in things indifferent, whiche all have the same grounde of obedience that the surplisse hath."—Whitgift. *Defense.* 258.

queen's injunctions or ordinances. Offending printers were to be restrained from following that trade any longer, or to derive any profit from it, to forfeit the obnoxious works, and to suffer three months' imprisonment. Vendors or binders were to forfeit twenty shillings for every offensive piece that passed through their hands. The Stationers' Company was to search for such works in the ports and all other suspected places; and every trader in books to be bound in recognizances for the strict observance of these orders[1]. Thus mere authority showed its hated face again. The irritated party was not to be thinned by free and calm discussion, which might have led many candid minds to see the abstract propriety of established ordinances, the expediency of conciliating Romish prejudice, and the extravagance of anti-papal zealots. Men were to bow in mute and uninquiring obedience before the royal prerogative. Perhaps experience hitherto half justified authority in forming this expectation, and fully justified its calculations of success. It was, however, a rash expectation, and attempts to act upon it rooted the seed which eventually ripened in a fearful harvest.

Neither press nor pulpit being open to the Puritans, their eyes turned eagerly to parliament[2]. It met in the autumn, but gave them no satisfaction. Romanists, however, cite one of its acts to confirm the epithet *parliamentary*, which they fain would fasten on the English hierarchy. To Boner, of persecuting memory, then confined in the Marshalsea, therefore within his diocese, Bishop Horne tendered the oath of supremacy. Boner declining it, was indicted in the Court of King's

---

[1] Dated at the Star-chamber, June 29, 1566.—STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 443.

[2] STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 439.

Bench. He there admitted his refusal, but denied a legal tender of the oath; Mr. Robert Horne, as he styled his prosecutor, being no diocesan of his, nor, in fact, any bishop at all. An ordinary court of law was but ill qualified for questions upon consecration, the province of divines and canonists. But Boner's counsel, no less men than Plowden and Wray, were furnished by himself with sufficient standing room upon legal technicalities. Horne's consecration might be represented as impeachable, because insufficiently protected by that act, in the queen's first year, which abrogated Mary's religious policy, and revived Edward's. Through such an opening forensic ingenuity would soon have made way for briefs in abundance. Leases might be set aside, or some other selfish end be answered, for which lynx-eyed greediness and necessity are ever on the watch. It was, therefore, needful to nip all such expectations in the bud. An act, accordingly, was passed, affirming the full validity of episcopal consecrations hitherto effected under the queen's authority, and of all that might be similarly circumstanced hereafter. Property and jurisdiction require such interference, but spiritual privileges have a higher origin. The prelacy of later times is no more, therefore, a body merely parliamentary than its predecessor was. To both are common civil sanctions, identical in kind and purpose. Legislative intervention having diverted legal acuteness from episcopal consecrations, judiciously threw a protecting mantle over Boner. It was enacted that none should suffer in person or property for any refusal of the oath of supremacy, already given, or to be given, before the parliament then sitting should separate[1].

---

[1] Collier. *Eccl. Hist.* ii. 492, 510. Fuller, observing from this incident, upon the term *parliamentary*, applied by Romanists to

However the Puritans might be disappointed by parliamentary neglect, it was wholly powerless to shake their constancy. Repugnance to the habits continued in London with unabated vigour, many thinking no conforming clergyman endurable. Perhaps this prejudice might owe some of its violence to the venerable Coverdale. He seems to have declined any episcopal appointment, on the queen's accession, from vestural antipathies, and had contented himself with a slender provision as rector of St. Magnus, by London Bridge. His great age, and still greater services to the Protestant cause, entitled him to a connivance which was not refused, but he occupied a succession of pulpits, probably, that he might give no needless offence. In spite of this uncertainty, he was always greeted by an overflowing congregation. Crowds called at his house on week-days, anxious to know where he would preach on the following Sunday. Even an ordinary mind, bending under eighty years, must indeed be vain, if haunted by a craving for mere popularity: but Father Coverdale, as his admirers called him, appears to have been sincerely pious. He was, therefore, pained by all this importunity, wishing to enter unexpectedly the pulpit provided for his next sermon[1]. Unhappily, however, invincible scruples are far

---

the English bishops, says, "As well might the Jesuits terme Shemaiah, Nethaniah, *prerogative levites*, because sent by Jehosaphat to preach the word to the people of the land. For that good king did not give, but quicken and encourage their *Commission* to teach, as here the Parliament did only publish, notifie, and declare the legall authority of the English bishops, whose *Call* and *Consecration* to their place was formerly performed, derived from *Apostolicall*, or at leastwise *Ecclesiasticall institution*."—*Ch. Hist.* B. IX. p. 80.

[1] STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 480. Coverdale, chiefly famed as a Biblical translator, was a Yorkshireman, and had been an Austin friar. He filled the see of Exeter from 1551 to 1553. On his deprivation by Mary, he was committed to prison,

better fitted for acting upon the public mind, than any degree of moderation.

Objections to the vestures, and some other points, received further confirmation from Foxe, the martyrologist. He had been anxious to obtain a prebend of Norwich, probably, to be near his friend Parkhurst, bishop of that see. Nor were endeavours wanting thus to requite his important services; but it was found impossible to procure this preferment for him. He was, then, provided for by the prebend of Shipton, in the church of Salisbury, which not only furnished him with a respectable maintenance, but likewise gave him an opportunity of transmitting a valuable lease to his descendants[1]. Further preferment was rendered hopeless, by his inconformity. He would not pledge himself to anything beyond Scripture, but answered an application for subscription, by producing a Greek Testament, and saying, "To this I will subscribe[2]." Foxe was, however, contented with a peaceable enjoyment of his opinions, and he suffered no molestation.

Popular opposition, encouraged by such examples, was not likely to abate, and violent spirits were betrayed into gross indecencies. They would hear no sermons,

---

but saved from further harm by an application from the king of Denmark, to whom his brother-in-law was chaplain. On his release, he became preacher to the refugee English at Wesel. Elizabeth's accession having restored him to his country, he would have regained the see of Exeter, or been otherwise beneficed among the prelacy, had not his scruples intervened. Then sinking into poverty, Bishop Grindal collated him to St. Magnus, a living which he must have declined, had not the queen forgiven him the first fruits. He died May 20, 1565, at the age of eighty-one, and was buried in St. Bartholomew's by the Exchange.—*Memorials.* iii. 240, 410. *Parker.* i. 295. *Annals.* i. pt. 2. p. 43.

[1] STRYPE. *Annals.* i. pt. 2. p. 44.

[2] NEAL. *Hist. Pur.* i. 188.

much less prayers or homilies, from conformists. Cap and surplice broke off acquaintance, forbade a civil salutation, provoked revilings in the public streets, hurried occasionally a fiery zealot, even to the outrage of spitting in another's face[1]. While grosser humours were exploding thus offensively, serious nonconformists brooded over projects of separation. They thought of a London congregation that eluded notice in the late queen's reign, and secretly worshipped God according to Protestant opinions. Upon a similar course many now determined. Among them were some desirous to retain the established liturgy, only repudiating the vestures, and a few ceremonies. Others preferred a form of prayer composed for the English congregation at Geneva, and approved by Calvin. This was the party that prevailed, as might be expected, and clandestine congregations met in London. Thus Englishmen, though yet strangers to extemporaneous prayers, adopted a service without any national authority. Nor was a communion among themselves omitted[2].

So many took these decisive steps, that effectual concealment was impossible. The hierarchy, however, was disposed, apparently, for connivance. Humphrey, Sampson, and Lever, continued preaching, though resolute as ever to decline the habits[3]. But Elizabeth and her ministers became disgusted and alarmed. Hence a letter, signed by the privy council, was addressed to the ecclesiastical commission, enjoining an immediate trial of persuasion with the nonconforming Londoners: this failing, they were to lose the freedom of the city, and afterwards, to expect from disobedience, further penalties.

---

[1] "Some of you have taught, that pollution dothe sticke in the thinges themselves, as that the wearing of them had power to pollute and make uncleane the wearers: else why doe they refuse to come to our churches, our sermons, yea, to keepe us companie, or to salute us: why spitte they in our faces, revile us in the streates, and shewe such like like villanie unto us, and that onely bicause of our apparell?"—WHITGIFT. *Defense*. 256.

[2] STRYPE. *Grindal*. 169.

[3] *Ib.* 171.

Bishop Grindal was thus driven upon measures which he hated, and civil interference with Protestant nonconformity began its mistaken and disastrous course. The city authorities gained information of a considerable meeting at Plumbers' Hall, on the 19th of June. The room was hired ostensibly for the celebration of a wedding, but the sheriffs, going thither, found about one hundred persons, engaged in public worship. Fourteen or fifteen were seized, and committed to the Compter. Some of these were brought up, on the following morning, before the lord mayor, the bishop of London, and certain members of the ecclesiastical commission. Upon Grindal, as diocesan, fell the painful task of addressing the prisoners. He reasoned, persuaded, remonstrated, and finally desired an aged man, named John Smith, to assign the cause of all this disobedience. He was answered, that "so long as the word was freely preached, and the sacraments were administered, *without idolatrous gear*, they never assembled in private houses." Much unseemly altercation followed, and the commissioners, who argued chiefly from the royal authority, were boldly met by several gross personalities. Grindal observed, that he had said mass himself, and was sorry for it. "Why? you go," said one of the prisoners, "like a mass priest, still[1]." Nothing could be more ominous, than the whole of these proceedings. Protestant nonconformity now stood before the world, with a port of scorn and defiance, which is generally obstinate, and always infectious.

---

[1] Strype. *Grindal.* 175. *Parker.* i. 481.

Thus the seed, sown originally by Bishop Hooper, took tenacious hold of English ground. The martyred prelate and his earliest admirers would have been contented, seemingly, with vestural relief. Their followers assumed rapidly a position far bolder and more extended. Hence it seems unlikely that any concession short of unconditional surrender, would long have satisfied objectors. Most of them were bent upon entire conformity with Geneva. But among a party desirous of subverting completely existing prejudices and institutions, many are always found ready with new demands. Had it been wise, therefore, to disregard wavering Romanists and Edwardian Protestants, yet such indifference to a great preponderance of English feeling must have failed of securing religious uniformity. This fact could escape neither the government nor the ruling churchmen, and may fairly excuse refusal to give way. Their conduct under the difficulties and mortifications which crowded upon them was, indeed, often both injudicious and reprehensible. But great allowance must be made for imperfect civilization, and for the general prevalence of arbitrary principles. Nor should it be forgotten that both parties aimed at exclusive possession. They were, perhaps, equally hostile to the toleration of any opinions but their own. Certainly the greater liberality, if such there were, does not appear to have flowed from intercourse with Geneva.

CHAPTER II.

ORIGIN OF ROMISH RECUSANCY.

1568—1571.

MARY, QUEEN OF SCOTS—PIUS THE FIFTH—STATE OF ENGLAND—ROMISH FUGITIVES—THE SEMINARIES—FIRST PAPAL CONSPIRACY AGAINST ENGLAND—RIDOLFI—ATTENDANCE OF THE QUEEN OF SCOTS AT ENGLISH PRAYERS—FIRST PAPAL MISSION TO ENGLAND—HARDING—SANDERS—INJURY TO THE RELIGIOUS CHARACTER OF ROME—MORTON AND WEBB'S MISSION—PAPAL PREPARATIONS—THE CONSPIRACY PARTIALLY DISCOVERED—THE DUKE OF NORFOLK ARRESTED—THE NORTHERN REBELLION—PAPAL BULL TO DETHRONE THE QUEEN—DISLIKED BY MANY ENGLISH ROMANISTS—FELTON'S PUBLICATION OF THE BULL—THE ROMISH SECESSION—ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF IT—NEW PENALTIES AGAINST ROMANISM.

WHILE a few modest vestures, and time-honoured ceremonies, occasioned violent heats in the Protestant body, artful Romanists gloated over the strife with keenest exultation[1]. The Reformers receded every day, more

---

[1] They sought to augment it, in two known cases, by feigning Puritanism. Thomas Heath, brother to the deprived archbishop of York, came over from a Jesuits' college, with a supply of Anabaptiscal and Arian tracts. His general deportment, however, was that of a Puritan, and as such he preached, during six years. While occupying the pulpit in Rochester cathedral, a letter dropped from him, which was found to have come from a Jesuit, at Madrid, giving instructions for the management of his mission. A search in his lodgings produced a papal license, authorising him to preach any doctrine that his superiors thought fit. He was placed in the pillory, at Rochester, three several days, his ears were cut off, his nose slit, and his forehead branded R. He was besides to be imprisoned for life. He died within a few months. —COLLIER. ii. 518.

Another impostor of this kind, was a Dominican friar, known as *Faithful Cummin*, who became very popular in Kent, by his Puritanical sermons. Having fallen under suspicion, he was apprehended, but escaped. His real character does not seem to have been thoroughly discovered, until some Englishmen met him on the widely from that unanimity to which all parties reckoned upon reducing the religious world. Many also of the most zealous and active among them were so intemperate and indiscriminate in their attacks upon everything venerable for antiquity, that all who felt any reverence for the past, were naturally disgusted and alarmed. What had been represented as a judicious and conciliatory settlement, seemed likely to prove nothing more than a feverish respite from illimitable innovation. Such feelings were fatal to the subsidence of Romish prejudice. Englishmen, who had accepted unwillingly the compromise offered by their own government, would hear of no concessions for Geneva. If religious authority must again be sought abroad, why not return to Rome? Under this growing dissatisfaction, papal partisans could safely denounce a hollow spirit of outward conformity. It might prove the cowardly parent of intolerable ills, ensuring eventual opposition from all moderate men. Thus the progress of Protestant conviction, so happily begun in many unpromising quarters, received a serious check, and Romish prepossessions regained an embarrassing ascendancy.

This disturbing force was aided in operating upon English good sense, by the unexpected arrival of Mary, queen of Scots[1]. Human pride often regrets that gran-

---

Continent. His case was recorded by Cecil, in a memorandum book, with this introduction: "In these days" (1567) "men began to speak against the reformed prayers, established first by King Edward the Sixth and his parliament, and since by her majesty and her parliament. Upon which account, divers Papists disguisedly spoke as bitterly against the reformed prayers of the Church, as those then called Puritans did."—STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 485.

[1] At Workington, in Cumberland, May 16, 1568. She escaped from the castle of Lochleven, May 2, and was finally defeated in the battle of Langside, May 13. From that fatal field, she fled precipitately into England.

deur sadly lingers, even where it comes at last. Mary's hopes were not, however, mocked by splendid expectations merely, until age allowed a stately gravity at best. Cradled on a throne, her earliest perceptions were scenes that fascinate mankind. Nor was she left to discover gradually that penury, difficulty, danger, and semi-barbarism, to which a Scottish prince was born. Her kingdom's contiguity to England, and her own prospect of succession to that important crown, rendered her an advantageous match for the proud heir of powerful, refined, and wealthy France. To that favoured land, accordingly, she was transferred, when barely six years old[1]. On marrying the Dauphin[2], her father-in-law, Henry II., had hardly entered upon middle age; Mary, therefore, had no reasonable prospect of attaining early that height of splendour which was ultimately to surround her. But here, again, seemingly, fortune was propitious. Henry was accidentally killed in his forty-first year[3]; and the queen of Scots, yet under seventeen, became centre of attraction in the most magnificent and gay among European courts. Her husband, Francis, a sickly boy, not sixteen, did not survive his father quite seventeen months[1]. This early widowhood may seem the first shock of Mary's adverse fate. Those who look beyond the surface, will judge differently. The flattery and indulgence of every kind, which had poisoned her moral system from infancy, was really one continuous misfortune. Nothing could augur worse for happiness, than the treacherous pride, fed assiduously and ingeniously with every expanding thought, which allowed her to assume the style and arms of English royalty, when Mary of England died[2]. The situation which precipitated her into this insult of Elizabeth, was not enviable, but pitiable. It tempted her into an offence, ever likely to rankle in the breast of a powerful sovereign, most intimately connected with herself. It pushed her forward as a reckless partisan of Rome, under the most anti-social, odious, and indefensible of its assumptions. It aroused her own malignant passions, and supplied a fire-brand for disaffection and fanaticism. Older heads, however favourable to Mary's claims, immediately saw the folly of parading them thus needlessly and prematurely[3]. The unhappy girl herself had encountered nothing to awaken suspicion of haughty gratifications.

---

[1] In consequence of a parliamentary arrangement hastily made at Haddington, June 5, 1548. Mary was born Dec. 8, 1542.—ROBERTSON. *Hist. Scotl.* Lond. 1809. i. 297, 331.

[2] "Mary Stuart had just completed her fifteenth year, she was married to Francis, a prince of nearly the same age, in the cathedral of Paris (April 24, 1558): he was immediately saluted by his consort with the title of king-dauphin; and to cement the union of the two nations, the natives of each were by legislative acts naturalised in the other."—LINGARD'S *History of England.* Lond. 1825. vii. 369.

[3] July 10, 1559. Henry received his mortal wound from the Count de Montgomeri, at a tournament to celebrate the marriage of his daughter Elizabeth with Philip II., and that of his sister Margaret with the duke of Savoy. He lingered twelve days.

Catharine de' Medici, mother of Francis, was naturally mortified at the sudden loss of her own importance on her husband's untimely death. The new king, Charles IX., was a child in his eleventh year[1]; and she took effectual measures for securing, during his minority, that power which her ambitious temper eagerly desired, but which Mary's influence over the weak mind of Francis had lately fixed in the house of Guise[2]. The young widow was now repaid by studied neglect, and the queen-mother had evidently determined upon crushing finally the aspiring family of Lorraine. Mary soon felt her position in France, not only materially altered, but also hopelessly uncomfortable[3]. She was thus prepared for listening to the importunities of her subjects, and the advice of her uncles: both urging an immediate return to Scotland. Having brought herself to this unwelcome step, a brilliant escort was prepared for attending her to the shore[4]. This was decent and politic in Catharine; but it must often have embittered Mary's regrets. It was, indeed, a painful contrast with subsequent scenes of penury, coarseness, and misery.

---

[1] Francis died Dec. 5, 1560.—SMEDLEY'S *History of the Reformed Religion in France.* Lond. 1832. i. 147. His disorder was an imposthume in the ear.

[2] Mr. Turner attributes this hasty act to Henry II., her father-in-law; and it must necessarily have had his concurrence.—*Modern Hist. of Engl.* Lond. 1829. iii. 542.

[3] "The secretary Dardois also was sent out of France, to do the like in the name of the Dauphin of France, and the queen of Scotland his spouse, giving them this new stile: *In the name of Francis and Mary, king and queen of Scotland, England, and Ireland, dauphin and dauphinois of Viennois.* Whereat the duke d'Alva and Cardinal Granvel smiled, saying, This will breed some business ere it be long."—SIR JAMES MELVIL'S *Memoirs.* Lond. 1683. p. 23.

The reluctant voyager was not fully nineteen, when she trod again her paternal soil[5]. She found herself not only cut off from the gaiety and magnificence which extended nearly through her whole recollections, but also plunged in political difficulties requiring the best energies of mature ability. Knox preceded her by more than two years[6], and his fervid invectives had raised national abhorrence of Popery to an ungovernable height.

---

[1] SMEDLEY. i. 148.

[2] ROBERTSON. *Hist. Scotl.* ii. 37; MELVIL'S *Memoirs*. 29.

[3] MELVIL. 30.

[4] ROBERTSON. *Hist. Scotl.* ii. 47, 56.

[5] She landed at Leith, Aug. 19, 1561.—*Ib.* 57.

[6] He arrived in Scotland, finally, in May, 1559.—M'CRIE'S *Life of Knox.* Edinb. 1818. i. 256.

The nobility were delighted with a doctrine that augmented their estates enormously with the spoils of the church. The populace gladly heard a call to petty plunder, and wanton mischief, in charges of superstition, levelled at edifices attesting the pious magnificence of past ages[1]. Minds alive to the value of scriptural truth, were naturally anxious to retain and improve present religious advantages, even at the cost of some excesses that they could not cordially approve. Thus Mary found, on arriving in Scotland, everything overthrown that she had been trained in considering essential to the Catholic religion. The Church's patrimony had extensively passed into the tenacious grasp of private families, the proudest religious monuments had been reduced, either by popular violence, or legislative vandalism, to heaps of mouldering ruins; every doctrine, every usage, peculiar to Romanism, was execrated as a disgrace to the Christian name, and a curse to the land[2]. Hence Mary found it far from easy to obtain toleration for mass, even in her own chapel[3].

She had come, however, from France, so thoroughly cautioned and instructed by her uncles, that all her early acts were highly judicious. Whatever might be her dislike of the Protestants, she consulted and trusted them exclusively; well aware of their influence in the nation[4]. Unhappily, on her marriage with Henry, Lord Darnley[5], she bade farewell to discretion. As to family, she made a wise choice. Her new husband's father, Matthew Stuart, earl of Lennox, was great-grandson to Mary, sister of James III., and many represented him as next heir to the crown of Scotland, after herself[1]. Darnley's mother, Margaret Douglas, being daughter to James the Fifth's queen, Margaret Tudor, by her second husband, Archibald Douglas, earl of Angus, was, after Mary, the representative of Henry VII., in case of Queen Elizabeth's demise without issue[2]. When Darnley first visited Scotland, he was a tall, accomplished youth of eighteen, excellently proportioned, but effeminately faced. Mary no sooner saw him than she gazed upon his handsome form, and was violently smitten[1]. He could not, however, wait until marriage had secured his prize without an outbreak of impatient, headstrong, wilful temper[2]. In perfect consistency with a prelude so ominous, he soon entered upon those insolent humours and sensual excesses which commonly beset young people, tempted by opportunity and released from control[3]. Mary's youthful passions quickly caught the contagious flame. Love was thrust out by loathing. By means of a jovial young Italian plebeian, introduced as a bass singer, and afterwards appointed her French secretary, though quite incompetent for that office, Darnley's vengeance was glutted, and Mary's ruin sealed[1]. Unwarned by the savage murder of that upstart foreigner, almost under her own eyes[2], the tears of grief

---

[1] Knox himself was naturally disgusted by these outrages. Hence he attributes a destructive riot that followed a sermon of his at Perth, to "the rascal multitude." (M'Crie's *Life of Knox.* 260.) Grave men should beware of using their own powers in such a way as to work upon the wild, sordid, and mischievous humours of a crowd.

[2] Robertson. *Hist. Scotl.* ii. 47.

[3] *Ib.* 61.

[4] *Ib.* 62.

[5] Sunday, July 30, 1565. Thomas Randolph to the Earl of Leicester. Ellis's *Original Letters* Lond. 1824. ii. 201.

---

[1] James Hamilton, earl of Arran, and duke of Chatelherault, once regent of Scotland, was descended from the Princess Mary's son, whereas Lennox was descended from her daughter. But then Hamilton's father divorced his first wife, Elizabeth Home, and married Janet Beatoun, aunt of Cardinal Beatoun. The regent was born while Elizabeth Home lived, and therefore many maintained that he was illegitimate, and that the earl of Lennox was really, after the reigning queen, the representative of James II. His paternal house was also a branch of that family which reigned in Scotland. —ROBERTSON. *Hist. Scotl.* note i. 309. CAMBDEN'S *Elizabeth*, ap. KENNET. *Hist. Engl.* ii. 395.

[2] There were those who maintained, that the countess of Lennox had better claims to the English succession than the queen of Scots. She was daughter to the elder sister of Henry VIII. Mary was grand-daughter. It is true that she was younger than Mary's father, and born of a second marriage with a subject. The former objection would now be decisive immediately against her: but the sixteenth century had not quite attained such precision. Then, Lady Lennox was born in England, and hence, according to some lawyers, might inherit, where Mary, as an alien, was excluded. It is obvious, that Darnley, by marrying into some powerful English family, or becoming a zealous Protestant, might have become, by means of these legal subtleties, a dangerous rival to Mary, an alien and a Papist, for the crown of England. (ROBERTSON. *Hist. Scotl.* ii. 104.) Cambden says that Darnley's descent from her own paternal ancestors was an additional recommendation with Mary. "Nor did she desire more earnestly any one thing, than that she might be so happy to devolve the two kingdoms of England and Scotland on some person of Scottish extraction, who might entail the succession thereof in the name and family of the Stuarts."—396.

---

[1] "He was, indeed, a gentleman whose person might well become the honour of a crown, extreamly handsome, and of a temper as well mixed as his outward proportions." (CAMBD. 396.) Queen Elizabeth having received an evasive answer from Sir James Melvil, when she asked his opinion of Leicester, said, "'You like better of yonder long lad,' pointing toward my Lord Darnly, who, as nearest prince of the blood, did bear the sword of honour that day before her. My answer was, that 'No woman of spirit would make choice of such a man, who more resembled a woman then a man: for he was handsom, beardless, and lady-faced.'" (*Memoirs*. 48.) When Mary, however, first saw him at Wemys, in her progress through Fife, she pronounced him "the properest and best-proportioned long man that ever she had seen: for he was of high stature, long and small, even and straight. He had been from his youth well instructed in all honest and comely exercises."—*Ib*. 56.

[2] "His words to all men agaynste whom he conceaveth anye dyspleasure, how unjuste soever yt be, so prowde and spytefull, that rather he seemethe a monarche of the worlde, then he that not long since we have seen and knowne the Lord Darlye. She cane as myche prevaile with hym in any thynge that is agaynste hys wyll, as your Lordship maye with me, to perswade that I sholde hange myself. Thys laste dignetie, owte of hande to have byne proclaimed Kinge, she wolde have had yt dyffered untyll yt were agreed by Parlemente, or had byne hymself of xxj yeres of age, that thyngs done in hys name myght have the better autoritie. He would in no case have yt dyffered one daye; and ether then or never." He was, in fact, proclaimed king, at nine o'clock, in the evening of the day before his marriage, Saturday, July 29. This point was not conceded until after a long debate, and the proclamation was received with a silence only broken by Darnley's own father, who cried out, "God save his Grace."—Randolph to Leicester. July 31, 1565. ELLIS'S *Orig. Letters*. ii. 202.

[3] "Addicted to drunkenness, beyond what the manners of that age could bear, and indulging irregular passions, which even the licentiousness of youth could not excuse, he, by his indecent behaviour, provoked the Queen to the utmost, and the passions which it occasioned often forced tears

from her eyes, both in public and private." (Robertson. *Hist. Scotl.* ii. 163.) "The yong Kyng is so insolent as his father is weary of his government, and is departed from the Court."—Sir W. Cecil to Sir T. Smith. 1 Sept. 1565. Ellis's *Orig. Letters.* Second Series. Lond. 1827. ii. 303.

[1] "Now there came here in company with the ambassador of Savoy, one David Rixio, of the county of Piedmont, who was a merry fellow and a good musician. Her Majesty had three valets of her chamber, who sung three parts, and wanted a bass to sing the fourth part. Therefore they told her Majesty of this man, as one fit to make the fourth in consort. Thus he was drawn in to sing sometimes with the rest, and afterwards, when her French secretary retired himself to France, this David obtained the said office." (Melvil. 54.) "David Rixio, lately admitted to be her French secretary, was not very skilful in inditing French letters, which she did write over again with her own hand."—*Ib.* 42.

[2] Hume appears to have considered that Rizzio received his first wound before he was dragged out of the queen's presence, and Robertson's language is not precise to the contrary. A despatch from the earl of Bedford and Mr. Thomas Randolph to the privy council of England, March 27, 1566, says that the queen, Lady Argyll, and Rizzio, were supping together in a cabinet, about twelve feet square. The poor Italian had his cap on his head. Darnley, entering with Ruthven and two others, called to Rizzio, "Come out: this is no place for you." Mary said, "It is my will that he should be here." Darnley replied, "But it is against your honour." Ruthven then would have taken Rizzio by the arm, saying, "You should learn your duty better." The victim, however, prevented him by running behind the queen, and seizing her gown. Darnley immediately loosed his hands, and held her in his arms. Rizzio was now dragged out of the cabinet, through an adjoining bed-room, into the presence chamber. There were the Lords Morton and Lindsay, and the intention was to hang him on the following day, most probably, after some sort of trial. Many persons of inferior note were, however, about, and one of them stabbed him, as it seems, in the presence-chamber. But if so, the work of death was only begun there. We learn from the despatch: "He was not slayne in the Quenes presens, as was saide, but

and rage were scarcely dried, before she became besotted by a fresh attachment, and a worse. In Rizzio's case, folly, not guilt, seems to have possessed her. Her new confidence alighted on one who quickly talked of love Yet this young gallant, James Hepburn, earl of Bothwell, like herself, was married[1]. He was, however, soon set free by a convenient divorce, she, by an atrocious murder. Henceforth, Mary was a stranger to character and happiness. Her Protestant subjects immediately treated her as an accessory to Darnley's assassination. The Romish party denied such privity, as did many of the English Episcopalians[2]. Her guilt is, however, unquestionable, if certain letters and sonnets, produced as evidence against her, be genuine, and that they are, is more than probable[3]. At all events, her conduct wears the brand of that indiscreet and indecent levity for which youth alone can plead any excuse, and which effectually blights the prospects of a life. She might fairly complain of her hard lot in being thrown, without control, amid such difficulties as were likely to baffle the most experienced head, such provo-

---

goinge downe the stayers owte of the chamber of presence."—ELLIS'S *Orig. Letters.* First Series. ii. 210.

[1] A note in Hume establishes the youth both of Rizzio and Bothwell. Darnley was the youngest of all these victims to seductive opportunities for licentiousness and folly: but none of them had attained an age to make their conduct so inexcusable as it seems to those who merely think of the stations that they respectively filled. Such importance usually comes later in life, much to the advantage both of society, and of the individuals themselves.

[2] "The infamy of this horrid murther is generally cast upon the Queen, by the arts of those whom it concerned to make her odious with all honest men; nor did there want some strong presumptions which might induce them to believe that she was of the counsel in the fact; and with the good brethren of the congregation, every presumption was a proof, and every weak proof was thought sufficient to convict her of it."—HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 193.

[3] Robertson's *Dissertation* at the close of his history, (p. 229) fully and acutely discusses the genuineness of these conclusive documents.

cations and allurements as could hardly fail of proving an overmatch for a giddy female under twenty-five. Every serious mind must feel that such an apology has extenuating powers even for the most unfavourable view of Mary's case. But the moral interests of mankind restrain, from acting upon a view so charitable. Pity for the offender must not cover the offence. Hence the grave alone can sever crime from suffering. Mary, therefore, though severely treated, both at home and in England, had really little or no cause to tax the world with injustice. The miserable age that succeeded a youth, seemingly so fortunate, was no more than the penalty earned by her own vicious folly, and necessarily exacted for the protection of society.

The papal chair had now an occupant most unlikely to overlook the opening afforded by Mary's residence in England. Michael Ghislieri was born in the Milanese, in the year 1504, of a family, ancient, but reduced. His parents meant him for some humble secular occupation, but he spurned inglorious labour, and entered a Dominican friary, at fourteen. Thus an order, famed for connexion with the Inquisition, furnished trammels for his growing intellect. When adult, Ghislieri's established scholarship gained him many pupils, and a considerable degree of public notice. His reputation chiefly rested upon the maintenance of papal authority, and upon hostility to those revivals of primeval Christianity which Rome would fain discredit by the brand of heresy. Unblemished morals adding lustre to this professional celebrity, Ghislieri was appointed superior of a monastery. But his ardent spirit soon became impatient of stagnating in a cloister, and he gladly emerged in the exciting character of Inquisitor. Activity in this congenial occupation, recommended him for a cardinal, and on the seventh of January, 1566, he was elected Pope. He styled himself Pius V.[1]

The new pontiff's theological competence admits of an easy estimate. He was conspicuous for devotion to the blessed Virgin, and unremitting in his invocations of her: an example which he took pains to render popular, though none to reconcile with Scripture, or common sense. He manifested an extraordinary veneration for relics, and was an eager collector of them[2]. Such divinity, combined with fierce and intolerant bigotry, natural to the president of inquisitors, will account sufficiently for Ghislieri's conduct as assumed head of Christendom. Under him also the Trentine catechism was authentically promulged, as a manual of instruction for such clergymen as prefer the new theology of Rome to that of Scripture and antiquity[3]. By this publication, however, both Romanists and their opponents are liable to be misled. Although admitted as the standard of Romish belief, by every authority short of that which the council itself alone could have given, this deficiency is fatal to its conclusive effect. If the catechism be found speaking plainly, where the council speaks ambiguously, a difficulty will always be evaded, by conveniently charging the catechetical committee with pushing incautiously beyond its authorised bounds[1].

---

[1] MENDHAM. *Life of St. Pius V.* Lond. 1832. 8, 16, 20.

[2] "Era si divoto della beata Vergine, e si raccommandava talmente nel suo santo aiuto che non lasciò di dire, essendo anchor Papa, e occupato in tanti negotii, il Rosario, e gli aggiunse per cio molte altre indulgenze. Fù grandemente divoto delle Reliquie de Santi, e ne raccolse molte, mandonne al munisterio del Bosco fabricato da lui, e per riverenza delle quali, e de luoghi sacri levo l'usanza de correre i palii in Borgo San Pietro il Carnevale, dicendo, che ivi non era palmo di terreno che non fosse consecrato col sangue de martiri."—CATENA. *Vita del gloriosissimo Papa Pio V.* Rom. 1587. p. 39.

[3] Published in 1566, the very year of Ghislieri's elevation to the popedom. It had been in hand altogether nearly five years, during about two of which the council was actually sitting.

Happily, when Pius entered upon his disgraceful enterprises against England, Elizabeth had firmly cemented her power. She mounted the throne, with finances in serious disorder: Henry, Edward, and Mary, having all died under an accumulation of debt. From this inveterate pressure had arisen an alarming deficiency in the national stock of warlike stores. Trusting to her own economy, the queen immediately sent extensive orders for armour, to Antwerp. Philip's jealousy, however, took fire, and he would not suffer his merchants to ship their goods. Making light of this new difficulty, Elizabeth obtained from Germany those supplies which their Spanish master would not allow to enrich the Netherlands. His narrow policy did worse for Antwerp than gall her merchants by a temporary disappointment. England awoke to a sense of her own resources. Neglected mines near Keswick were worked anew, and this impulse occasioned successful search for fresh veins of mineral treasure. Thus the country, lately repulsed as a customer, quickly became a manufacturer for her own wants, and an exporter to foreign states. Hitherto England had imported gunpowder. Elizabeth thought of its production by English industry, and this important article became a domestic manufacture. Her predecessors, wanting ships, had hired them at Hamburg, Lubeck, Dantzic, Genoa, Venice. The queen was bent upon acquiring a navy of her own, and she completely succeeded[1]. Ten peaceful years, thus judiciously improved, had consolidated national power, and widely laid the foundations of individual prosperity. The government was formidable, the people generally were thriving and contented.

---

[1] This management may be exemplified in the doctrine of *Attrition*, a very powerful hold upon the human mind. Scripture, seemingly, gives the sinner no hope of pardon without contrition. The Trentine catechism holds out the lure of reconciliation to God by the easier way *(faciliori ratione)* of attrition. The council itself had evidently no thought of relinquishing this delightful scholastic doctrine, which, in fact, assigns to Romish priests the privilege of forgiving sins. Therefore, its catechetical committee may be fairly excused for talking so broadly of an *easier way*. Still the committee has, really, gone beyond the council, which is here verbose and ambiguous. Hence Pallavicino, who, like the Trentine fathers, was upon his guard against inquiries below the surface, denies their intention of concluding any thing upon the subject. They merely meant, he says, to condemn some Protestant attacks upon the scholastic doctrine, which had been needlessly vehement in stigmatising the fear of punishment. This may be so; but if it be, there is an end of Romish claims, even upon Romish grounds, to superior privileges for the reconciling of sinners to God. There is an end also to implicit reliance upon the authorised Romish manual for clerical instruction. This will need to be very narrowly compared with the Trentine decrees themselves. Whenever it contains anything inconvenient, which these may screen, it will be mercilessly given up. As to attrition, this is actually done. This *easier way* is represented, when necessary, as a school-doctrine, which the Council of Trent *has not* warranted, and which, therefore, the catechism, (though meant for instructing Romish clergymen,) *cannot* warrant. Thus the initiated among Romanists know both clergy and laity of their communion to lie under a gross delusion in fancying that Rome even *claims* the privilege of dispensing with genuine contrition. But what an awful delusion is here!—See *Catechismus ad Parochos.* Pars 2. De Poen. Sacram. 46. *Conc. Trid.* Sess. 14. cap. 4. PALLAV. *Ist. del Conc. di Trento.* i. 1003. Rom. 1656. The Author's *Bampton Lectures for* 1830. Sermon 5.

But every Englishman could not thrive, therefore, the queen had always discontented subjects. Ill conduct, miscalculation, unsteadiness of purpose, want of skill, or industry, or intellect, or economy, or even of good fortune, scatter disappointed men over all communities. Nor is the impatience of youth without a share in this mischief. Of such unquiet spirits, many flee to foreign parts, where they never fail to spread unfounded or exaggerated reports of difficulty and discontent at home. To the papal court, smarting under the loss of such a prize as England, no music was more delightful than the tales of these gaping fugitives[1]. It could not see that ten judicious years had consolidated Elizabeth's authority, by surrounding her with efficient means to repel aggression, and by clearly identifying the interests of all sober-minded Englishmen with the maintenance of their established government. Pius and his courtiers could think of nothing but national discontent, of inveigling from their ancestral churches those who still preferred a Romish ritual, and of rendering the Scottish Mary a beacon-fire to guide exasperated bigots, or bankrupt Catilines, into civil war.

---

[1] Bishop Carleton's *Thankful Remembrance of God's Mercy.* Lond. 1625. p. 4.

The papal resources could not, however, be made available for action, without a perennial stream of agents, and points of concentration, to serve as fortresses. These pressing deficiencies were first remedied by means of an establishment, conveniently stationed at Douay, under the skilful direction of William Allen, afterwards cardinal[2]. He was grave and judicious, kindly mannered, well conducted, free with his purse, as a partisan generally specious; though when the *Armada* fired his hopes, he threw off the mask, and acted the venomous incendiary. His institution was professedly a *seminary*, or place of Romish education. It served for the double purpose of harbouring fugitives, and for training a succession of devoted emissaries, to maintain the patronage of medieval errors and superstitions as needful to

---

[1] "These notable traitors and rebels have falsely informed many kings, princes, and states, and specially the Bishop of Rome, commonly called the Pope, (from whom they all had secretly their first comfort to rebel,) that the cause of their flying from their countries was for the religion of Rome, and for maintenance of the said Pope's authority. Whereas divers of them before their rebellion, lived so notoriously, the most part of their lives, out of all good rule, either for honest manners, or for any sense of religion, as they might have been rather familiar with Catalin, or favourers of Sardanapalus, than accounted good subjects under any Christian princes."—LORD BURGHLEY'S *Execution of Justice.* Lond. 1675. p. 3.

[2] Allen was the son of John Allen, of Ross Hall, in Lancashire, and of Jane Lister, sister of Thomas Lister, of Westby, in Yorkshire. His grandfather was George Allen, of Brook House, in Staffordshire. He was born in 1532. In 1547, he entered Oriel College in Oxford; and, in 1556, was chosen principal of St. Mary's

Hall in the same university. On the death of Queen Mary, he retired to Louvaine, and formed an intimate friendship with Dr. Stapleton and Dr. Harding, which subsisted through their lives. After spending some time in Louvaine, he returned to his native country. (Butler's *Historical Memoirs of the English Catholics.* Lond. 1821. iii. 146.) During his stay in England, he argued warmly among his friends, against attendance at church by those who lay under Romish prepossessions. To some of them this gave offence. Confirmed Protestants were still more displeased, and Allen, apprehensive, it is said, of a prosecution, again retired to the Continent. After a short residence in Flanders, he visited Rome. Hence, he travelled back to Mechlin, where he was ordained priest, and read lectures in divinity. He had long meditated the institution of a college for his countrymen Romishly inclined, and this end was accomplished in 1568. In 1576, a Huguenot riot caused the magistrates of Douay to issue a reluctant order for the departure of Allen and his society. The Guisian family then provided them with an asylum at Rheims, whither the establishment removed in 1578, and where it continued until 1593. It then returned to Douay, and subsisted there until the French revolution. Allen was made cardinal in 1587, and his name was paraded as the *Cardinal of England.* In 1589, he was appointed archbishop of Mechlin. He died in 1594, aged sixty-two. (*Ib.* 151, 153, 440. Dodd. ii. 44, 50.) When this institution was broken up at Douay, it was transferred to Old Hall Green, in the parish of Standon, and county of Hertford, where it still flourishes. A small estate, applicable to Romish education, directed it to this resting-place. It answers the double purpose of a boarding-school and a college for training ecclesiastics to officiate within the London vicariate: its foreign appropriation to seculars yet continuing. In one particular, the English house has varied from its continental predecessor. *That* was dedicated to Archbishop Becket; but a desire to avoid offence, has found a patron saint for the Hertfordshire college, in another canonised archbishop of Canterbury, Edmund, who filled that see in the thirteenth century.

the full integrity of Christianity. Douay did not long continue the only repository for this fatal seed. As it sprouted ominously upon English soil, political rivalry and religious bigotry were stimulated into exertions for a more extensive supply. Rome, Paris, Madrid, Lisbon, Valladolid, Seville, Louvaine, Ghent, Liege, and St. Omer's[1], eventually poured oath-bound ecclesiastics into England[2]. Disguised, as they necessarily came, and continued, the country soon felt itself overspread by fomenters of sedition, pedlars in superstitious toys, and libellers of the national religion[1]. Modern Romanists are offended

---

[1] The college at Rome was founded for the education of secular clergy, in 1578; but about the following year, though still used by seculars, it was placed under direction of the Jesuits. The colleges of Seville and Madrid were instituted about the same time with that of Rome. Neither prospered; but in 1589, the college of Valladolid was completed, and it proved a very efficient instrument. The Jesuits' college, at St. Omer's, was founded in 1594: it was removed to Bruges in 1764, and suppressed in 1773. The English seminary at Paris was founded about 1600; the college at Liege in 1616; that at Lisbon in 1622. The house at Louvaine was established by the Jesuits for novices, in 1605; in 1611, this was transferred to Watten, near St. Omer's. "In 1620, the Jesuits established their professed house at Ghent; it was particularly destined for the infirm and aged, and for such as were otherwise disabled from active duty in the society."—BUTLER'S *Hist. Mem.* iii. 172, 440.

[2] The following oath was taken by the Seminarists. "I, A. B., one bred in this English college, considering how great benefits God hath bestowed upon me, but then especially, when he brought me out of mine own country, so much infected with heresy, and made me a member of the Catholic Church; as also desiring with a thankful heart, to improve so great a mercy of God, have resolved to offer myself wholly up to divine service, as much as I may, to fulfil the end for which this our college was founded. I promise, therefore, and swear, in the presence of Almighty God, that I am prepared from mine heart, with the assistance of divine grace, in due time to receive holy orders, and to return into England, to convert the souls of my countrymen and kindred, when, and as often, as it shall seem good to the superiors of this college." (FULLER. *Ch. Hist.* 92.) Moore attributes this oath to the persuasion of Persons, and thus gives it as imposed in the Roman college. "Ego, N. N., considerans quantis me Deus beneficiis affecerit, &c.: Promitto me, juvante gratia, sacros ordines suo tempore recipere, et in Angliam reverti, ut illic animas gentilium meorum convertam, quando hujus collegii superiori videbitur in Domino mihi illud imperare."—*Hist. Miss. Angl. Soc. Jesu.* 58.

---

[1] "Because they could not readily prevail by way of force, finding foreign princes of better consideration, and not readily inclined to their wicked purposes, it was devised to erect up certain schools, which they called *Seminaries*, to nourish and bring up persons disposed naturally to sedition, to continue their race and trade, and to become seedmen in their tillage of sedition, and them to send secretly into these, the Queen's Majesty's realms of England and Ireland, under secret masks, some of priesthood, some of inferior orders, with titles of *Seminaries* for some of the meaner sort, and of *Jesuits* for the stagers and ranker sort, and such like: but yet, so warily they crept into the land, as none brought the marks of their priesthood with them, but in divers corners of her Majesty's dominions, these *Seminaries*, or seedmen, and Jesuits, bringing with them certain Romish trash, as of their hallowed wax, their *Agnus Dei*, many kinds of beads, and such like, have, as tillage-men, laboured secretly to persuade the people to allow of the pope's foresaid bulls and warrants, and of his absolute authority over all princes and countries, and striking many with pricks of conscience to obey the same: whereby in process of small time, if this wicked and dangerous, traitorous and crafty course had not been, by God's goodness, espied and stayed, there had followed imminent danger of horrible uprores in the realms, and a manifest bloody destruction of great multitudes of Christians."—*Execution of Justice*, 6.

"These," (the *Seminaries*,) "in truth, were maintained by the adversaries of England, as a seminary of rebellion; for so still they proved. Their first foundation was at Douay, in the Low Countries, where, by the procuring of William Allen, an Oxford man, afterwards cardinal, there was a college provided for them in the year 1568: where fugitive priests were brought up, not so much in religion, as in new and strange practices of treason."—Bishop Carleton's *Thankful Remembrance*, 54.

"It remaineth, then, that you would be pleased to be intreated by us, not to send, or suffer your children or friends to go beyond the seas unto them," (the *Seminaries*,) "that so they may be driven, if needs they will train up youths to make them traitors, to gather them up in other countries, whereby they shall not be able so much to infect or endanger us." (*Important Considerations by the Secular Priests*. Lond. 1675. p. 91.) This truly *important* disclosure of the views entertained by the ordinary Romish priesthood of England, was wrung from William Watson, one of their body, by the encroachments of the Jesuits. It was originally printed in 1601, again in 1675, again in Bishop Gibson's *Preservative against Popery*, and lately by the by pictures of these agents, copied from embarrassed, indignant contemporaries. They would overlook existing records establishing their dangerous character, and merely view the foreign seminaries as extorted by the penalties against domestic education in Romish principles[1]. But Englishmen really had no need of any other than their paternal institutions. The first ten years of Elizabeth elapsed without a continental seminary, and undisturbed by Romish secession from the national churches. Had not adventurers landed from abroad to fan the dying embers of papal prejudice, itself an off-shoot from earlier Paganism, there is every probability that a new generation would have arisen, wholly unsusceptible of the influence that crept insidiously through every preceding race. Hence facilities for sound education, both clerical and lay, were to be found sufficiently at home, and safely there alone.

---

seasonable procurement of Mr. Mendham. It feelingly and candidly exposes the political arts to which England owes a Romish sect and party. The disparaged and aggrieved secular priests thought their own exertions, as mere ministers of religion, quite sufficient to keep Romish opinions alive in the country. Rome thought the stimulus of politics to be necessary, and the shrewdness of this judgment appears to be unimpeachable.

[1] Hume says of the seminaries, that "sedition, rebellion, sometimes assassination, were the expedients by which they intended to effect their purposes against the queen." Mr. Butler pronounces this an "atrocious charge." (*Hist. Mem.* i. 239.) The charge, however, neither originated with Hume, nor is incapable of proof. The seminaries, it is stated, became necessary from the statute of the second of Elizabeth. "Without them, in the course of a few years, the Catholic priesthood must, under the operation of such laws, have been extinguished." (*Ib.* 238.) But the question still remains, whether politics were not necessary to prop the falling fortunes of the priesthood, here styled Catholic. Revolutionary projects are very liberal feeders of hope. Many spirits, apathetic under any discourse merely religious, would eagerly hear of a conscientious call to overthrow the government, and seize upon power, wealth, and honour.

The seminaries drew much of their support from England. Many opulent families, impressed with a belief that recent years had overthrown their country's ancient faith, were, notwithstanding, glad enough of any selfish advantage arising from the change. The suppression of monasteries was taxed with sacrilege, while their own pride and luxury were pampered upon conventual spoils. To reconcile principle with practice here, remittances to the seminaries were an admitted quit-rent. Rome withdrew her curse from such as paid it, recognising in their case, a sort of property, otherwise claimed inalienably for the church[1]. Thus prejudice, worthy to be the handmaid of selfishness, found a cheap remedy for many uneasy scruples. This liberality, too, was likely to be favourably remembered, upon the ultimate resumption of monastic estates, should papal ascendancy regain its former height. Such feelings, half sectarian, half interested, seconded importantly the bigotry, and politics of foreigners.

The seminaries rapidly acquired resources to make them formidable. The Douay foundation, however, gave Elizabeth, at first, no uneasiness. She reckoned upon gaining over the more deserving of its youth, by luring with preferment in the church. Those who were without solid claims to notice, it was thought, would gradually and safely disappear amid neglect and poverty[2]. Such anticipations fell, undoubtedly, very short of the sagacity usually seen at the queen's council-board. Religious dissent has a dangerous affinity, for the ill-humours, difficulties, and disappointments of society. Often alimented by politics, it is very liable to be made a varnish for interest and passion. But Elizabeth came to the throne with little experience of nonconforming bodies. Their earlier stages only had appeared, and in them, she saw mere symptoms of a temporary disorder, which her own firmness, and fuller information among the parties themselves, would eventually overcome.

---

[1] "It is incredible what a mass of money, (much in specie, more in exchange,) was yearly made over out of England, for the maintenance of these colleges: having here their provincials, sub-provincials, assistants, agents, coadjutors, familiars, &c., who collected vast sums for them, especially from Catholics possessed of considerable estates out of abbey-lands, his Holiness dispensing with them to hold the same with a clear conscience, if bountiful on all such occasions."—FULLER. *Ch. Hist.* 92.

[2] SANDERS. *De Schism. Angl.* 312.

While English statesmen were thus off their guard, Rome was diligently undermining the public tranquillity. The pope had first conceived hopes of meddling in British politics with some appearance of publicity. He despatched Vincent Lauro, bishop of Mondovi, towards Scotland, in the ostensible character of nuncio. Since it might be quite as useful to bribe sordid politicians, as to confirm inveterate prejudices, Lauro was liberally supplied with money. Some of this, no doubt, gladdened the palms of those interested spirits, who never move without an eye to private gain. But the nuncio himself was prevented, by the vigilance of Elizabeth's government, from proceeding beyond Paris[1]. This disappointment, however, merely gave a character of deeper treachery to the pope's machinations against England. Robert Ridolfi, a Florentine gentleman, long established in London, as a merchant, secretly forsook ordinary commerce for a more lucrative traffic in politics[2]. Pius furnished him very liberally with capital[1], and his new dealings rapidly grew extensive. His counting-house became not only the mart for corroboratives in honest prejudice, but also for incentives to treason, wherever there was disaffection, whether it rankled in Papist or Protestant[2]. Ridolfi's mercantile character was likewise useful in furnishing pretences for visits to the continent. If the English malcontents were anxious for instructions from Rome, for aid from the ferocious Ferdinand Alvarez de Toledo, duke of Alva, or from Philip II., his gloomy and bigoted master, their Italian friend found business to call him from his desk in London, to Italy, Flanders, or Spain[3]. To the Florentine's fitness for a seditious agency, Elizabeth's whole reign, after her first ten happy years, bears ample witness.

---

[1] CATENA. *Vita del P. Pio S.* p. 112.

[2] Cambden speaks of Ridolfi, in 1568, as having "lived for a long time, a factor, in London." (*Eliz.* 415.) Under 1571, he says, that he "had for fifteen years together been a merchant in London." (431.) Strype considers him to have come into England, about 1566. (*Ann.* i. p. 2. p. 220.) Ridolfi is commonly described as a *gentleman*,

Among the parties in communication with Ridolfi, was naturally Mary, queen of Scots[4]. That unhappy princess gave, however, early in her English detention, some indication of proving an unserviceable tool for papal purposes. While confined at Bolton Castle she had

---

and Catena calls him *gentilehuomo Fiorentino:* but he seems to have been originally a *bonâ fide* merchant. The Florentine aristocracy was, in fact, mercantile.

[1] He had 150,000 crowns placed at his disposal, on the eve of the northern rebellion.—STRYPE. *Ann.* i. pt. 2. p. 220.

[2] "Egli operò in maniera a nome del santità di Pio, *non solamente co Catolici, de quali n'e gran numero,* mà con molti di primieri Protestanti, li quali concorrevano à cio per diversi rispetti, altri per private inimicitie, che tengono con quei, che aspiravano alla successione della corona: altri sollevati da piu salde speranze con la mutation del governo; che si poteva far fondamento d'ogni buon fine." (CATENA. 114.) Fuenmayor says that Pius, by means of Ridolfi, "offrecio abundantissimos socorros de gente y dineros; que movieron no solo a los Catolicos, mas a Puritanos, y Protestantes, unos de contraria opinion, y otros desseosos de satisfazer a sus odios entre las turbaciones."—*Vida y Hechos de Pio V.* iii.

[3] *Five Causes shewed against the Queen of Scots.*—STRYPE. ii. Append. XIV. p. 468.

[4] *Ib.*

attended prayers in English. She might be told, and reasonably think, that the Latin dress, in which she had known most of them, was merely an evidence of their origin in an age when that language was vernacularly spoken. But it had become a badge of party. Hence Mary could not stop to think, whether words that a congregation understood, were agreeable to reason, ancient usage, and Scripture. Her interest was identified with Rome. Soon, accordingly, did rumours fly that she was wavering as to religion. These gave her, probably, honest pain. They could not fail of damping the hopes, to which a young woman, a prisoner, and a deposed sovereign, would fondly cling. She had even reason to believe, that Philip of Spain, the main bulwark of Romish fanaticism, was acquainted with her occasional presence at a service which he so much abhorred. Seriously disquieted by conduct thus convicted of indiscretion, and really doubtful, perhaps, of its consistence with sound religious obligation, the royal captive wrote for the papal pardon and absolution[1]. She never afterwards alarmed Elizabeth's enemies by any appearance of rendering herself unfit for their designs.

Mary's temporary countenance to the English ritual, however defensible it might seem to a plain understanding, or to a reader of his Bible, was, in fact, peculiarly inopportune. Three clergymen, who had withdrawn from England, were then again among their countrymen, and with episcopal authority from the Roman see. Their business was to invigorate the languid, lingering remains of Romish prejudice, and to mould individuals yet under its influence into an organised sect. The tangible machinery for these purposes, consisted in absolving the consciences of such as returned to popery; in dispensing with disorders, short of wilful murder, or other obliquities, liable to legal harm; and in granting absolution to those whom Rome branded as heretics, upon condition of a three years' abstinence from the service of the altar[1]. A consistent and fermentable mass was thus formed from early predilections, a hungry appetite for superstition, imperfect information, and idle fears, often symptomatic of waning faculties.

---

[1] Mary, queen of Scots, to Pope Pius V. from Castle Boulton, Nov. 30, 1568.—Fuller. *Ch. Hist.* 82.

Of the papal triumvirate, whose obstetric skill gave birth to an English Roman Catholic body, Cambden mentions two by name, the third by initials only. Thomas Harding, the first-named, is most commonly remembered as the antagonist of Jewel. He was born in 1512, and educated in Wykeham's two foundations. He became fellow of New College, Oxford, in 1536, and regius professor of Hebrew there, in 1542. Thus his youth embraced a period when the papal authority was indignantly disclaimed, and medieval adaptations of Paganism to Christianity were nodding to their fall. Harding's crown preferment proves his countenance to the divinity patronized at court[2]. He seemed, indeed, on Edward's accession, merely to have been restrained by prudence from proceeding much farther than Henry had allowed. In the country, zealous Protestants were edified by his instructions, as domestic chaplain to the Duke of Suffolk, father to Lady Jane Grey. In Oxford he was a diligent hearer and professed admirer of Peter Martyr. From St. Mary's pulpit he derided the Trentine fathers as *illiterate paltry Papists*[1], and inveighed against Romish peculiarities in a glittering stream of declamatory flourishes[2]. Crown patronage in papal hands opened, however, as if by magic, a flood of light upon him, and a well-timed conviction of having laboured under some gross mistake was encouraged by the treasurership of Salisbury and a prebend of Winchester. Like many others, hitherto finished specimens of worldly tact, and noted for a pliant faith which had never lagged when interest called, Harding could not muster face for a new recantation on Mary's death. He took up the character of a sufferer for conscience. Thus the prizes of his recent conversion became forfeited, and he was placed under a sort of easy restraint[3], from which he withdrew to the continent. Had Harding contented himself with an exile of devotion and obscurity, his renegade notoriety would have been in a great measure forgotten, and his ultimate profession might wear an aspect purely spiritual. But such a man's prominence in party combination is open to grave suspicion. Papal traditions were necessarily on his lips, but Mary of Scotland seated on the

---

[1] CAMBDEN. *Eliz.* 410. Of the third in this triumvirate the initials given are "T. P."

[2] LE BAS' *Life of Jewel.* 139.

---

[1] "Qui Tridentinos patres, ut *Illiteratos Pontificulos* Oxoniæ pro concione derisit."—HUMPHR. *Jo. Juel. Angli Epist. Sarisb. Vita et Mors.* Lond. 1573. p. 139.

[2] See *Hist. Ref.* iv. 714. Dodd lets Harding down very gently. We are told of him, "He appears to have been carried away with the stream in Henry VIII.'s reign, and to have been an occasional conformist, *at least*, under Edward VI."—*Ch. Hist.* ii. 95.

[3] "Thomas Harding, D.D., to remain in the town of Moncton Farly, in the county of Wilts, or sixteen miles compass about the same; or within the town of Tollerwilme, in the county of Dorset, or twenty miles compass about the same." (*Recusants which are abroad, and bound to certain places.*—STRYPE. *Annals.* i. 412.) Against the several names are marginal notes describing the parties. Harding is thus characterized:—"Learned. In King Edward's time, preached the truth; and now stiff in papistry, and thinking very much good of himself." Harding died at Louvaine, Sept. 16, 1572.—DODD. ii. 95.

English throne, and showering mitres on her more conspicuous friends, may be fairly considered as uppermost in his thoughts.

Nicholas Sanders, the second named by Cambden, also a Wykehamist, was born at Charlewood, in Surrey. At Oxford, he studied law, and proceeded bachelor in that faculty about 1550. On Elizabeth's accession he left his native land, and at Rome he was ordained priest by Goldwell, the ejected bishop of St. Asaph[1]. As a political libeller and incendiary, Sanders holds a foremost rank. *His forehead was flint, his tongue a razor*[2]. Charity fain would hope that he was at bottom an honest fanatic; but writings and acts like his have little semblance of misguided integrity. They need protection from weak or disordered intellect. Unfortunately, however, the father of Romish history has left but little room for any such apology. For working upon selfish passion and popular credulity, Sanders was invaluable. Seldom is a mere scholar found so reckless of assertion, so hostile to concession, so bold in action, and fertile in expedient. Hence the English refugees endeavoured, by Philip's interest, to have him made a cardinal[3]. But his turbulent career had closed before the papal court became fully alive to the policy of conferring this dignity upon an Englishman. Then its choice fell upon Allen, whose ordinary character had been that of a zealous divine, shunning the offensive politician. To Sanders, unquestionably, the Romish party and sect in England is largely indebted for existence. Papal obligations to him are not, however, without alloy. He is among the most virulent and indefatigible of priestly politicians upon record, yet his authority was instantly and greedily accepted for such historical views of the English Reformation as Romanists have ever circulated, and would fain believe. But his pictures have all the air of libels, turning upon mere personalities, conceived in the worst spirit, and rendered improbable by absurd, revolting admixtures[1]. His taciturnity was inconveniently defective[2]. He has chronicled facts injurious to the religious character of his party, by exhibiting it as a band of political conspirators[3]. Serious contemporary Romanists, accord-

---

[1] "Quæ sors" (exilium, sc.) "obtigit Thomæ Goldwello, reverendissimo episcopo Assaphensi, qui mihi manus presbyterii Romæ imposuit."—SANDERS. *De Vis. Mon. Eccl.* Lov. 1571. p. 686. DODD.

[2] "Silicem illi certe pro fronte, novaculam pro fronte fuisse."—BP. ANDREWES. *Tortura Torti.* 143.

[3] *The English Romanists in Bruxelles, to Philip, king of Spain.* (STRYPE. *Parker.* Append. LXXVI. p. 217.) The letter, which is Latin, and without any date of year, intreats the Spanish monarch to render his application to Rome more feasible by the assignment of a pension to Sanders from some ecclesiastical benefice. Strype says, "I am apt to think this was a device of Sanders himself, and some of his friends; and that he had secretly procured this letter to be wrote, thirsting after honour and wealth." (ii. 169.) The conjecture is not improbable, and the facts upon which it is built, ought to be kept in view by

---

those who would understand the origin of a Romish sect and party in England. The clerical agents were needy men, incessantly urging their claims upon the wealthiest monarch in Europe, and looking forward to a popish occupant of their national throne. Even the purest of them were likely to be stimulated and supported by these considerations. The more artful and violent were likely to think seriously of very little else.

[1] Sanders more than insinuates that Anne Boleyn was Henry VIII.'s own daughter; he tells, that Edward VI. was cut out of his mother's womb; his father brutally saying, that he could easily find new wives; and that Cranmer took his wife about in a chest, with other matters of like credibility. Malice may cling to such license, or levity may laugh at it; but its very front is injurious to historical credit, and the tales of Sanders are open to direct contradiction. Hence Bishop Andrewes is justified in designating these things, *prodigiosa mendacia*, and their author, *mendaciorum pater Sanderus*. He well adds of his tales, *Produnt enim ipsa se, tam sunt et turpia et stulta.*—*Tortura Torti*. 143.

[2] "Sanderus, homo non satis taciturnus."—*Jesuitismi Pars Secunda Autore* LAUR. HUMFREDO. 1584.

[3] *The Execution of Justice*

ingly, though professing respect for the man, felt wounded by the author[4]. He has, in truth, forged a two-edged sword, meant, indeed, for his own friends, and habitually in their hands, but adapted for turning effectively against them.

The triumvirate, which moulded Romish prejudice into nonconformity, stands here upon record in a light purely religious. Protestants cannot help regretting that new vitality should have been given to a principle of discord, when peacefully and gradually hastening to extinction. But Romanists, who conscientiously identify their peculiar tenets with the Catholic faith, may allowably view the spiritual exertions of Rome to retain hold of England as a sacred papal duty. The next movement of Pius has no longer a hope of receiving this commendation openly from any quarter. A Christian divine who treated the Virgin Mary as a goddess, and relics as objects of religious veneration, was likely to labour under an honest conviction that Englishmen generally were drowned in heresy. It is far less credible that mere misapprehension could blind any man to the responsibility of instigating civil war. Undoubtedly the Pope's understanding must have been warped and his passions unhumanised as director of inquisitors. Still, an acute elderly man, act-

---

quotes and translates his account, from his work *De Visibili Monarchia Ecclesiæ*, of Morton's mission to stir up the northern rebellion. Many other passages, injurious to the spiritual character of Romanism, have also been cited from him.

[4] "It little became either Master Saunders, (otherwise an excellent man,) or Master Parsons, or any other of our own nation, to have intermeddled with those matters," (French and Scottish politics,) "or to write, as they have very offensively done, in divers of their books and treatises; to what purpose, we know not, except it were to shew their malice, to dishonour their own country as much as lay in them, and to move a greater dislike in the state of all that be Catholicks, than before they had."—*Important Considerations.* 56.

ing the reckless political incendiary, appears chargeable with something worse than error of religious judgment. As a worldly politician, Pius did exactly that which the case required. England had been gliding, imperceptibly, during ten years, beyond reach of papal influence. The sudden revival of old prepossessions might prove, therefore, nothing more than a temporary flash. A new generation would be likely to number the superstition of its predecessor among things grown completely out of date. But overcome exclusion from power; open a prospect of hiding embarrassment, if not of retrieving it; arouse the dormant appetite for turbulence and plunder, the convulsion might overthrow established authority at once. Or if success were not so complete, injuries undergone would rankle for generations; obstinate animosities would be engendered between the victorious and the baffled; principles would be avowed, for pride afterwards to keep inviolate, and for transmission as family heir-looms. The papacy really had little prospect of maintaining a Romish sect in England, without cementing and exasperating it by political movements. In deciding, therefore, against public tranquillity, Rome discovered her usual shrewdness. Perhaps the design refused her a mantle of decency. Foreign Romanists evidently thought none required. The more serious of their English brethren were driven into a very different conclusion. They saw treason spreading misery around, and heaping disgrace upon their peculiar opinions. Authors, patronized at Rome, ostentatiously traced all this load of distress and infamy to the Pope. Whatever England had of solid Romish piety, drew back in shame and sorrow, protesting that papal facility had been abused[1].

---

[1] "It pitieth our hearts to see and read, what hath been printed

Among clergymen who fled soon after the queen's coronation, was Dr. Nicholas Morton, sprung from a gentleman's family at Bawtry, in Yorkshire, prebendary of York, and one of the six preachers in the cathedral of Canterbury[1]. He seems to have taken refuge at Rome[2]. An English exile of any promise would be likely to find subsistence there, and could hardly fail of receiving remittances from home. But such a provision rapidly becomes irksome to the receiver and onerous to his benefactors. Hence an independent spirit pants for an opportunity to substantiate its claims, and patrons are equally impatient for the services upon which they originally reckoned. Had any fugitive encountered expostulation in the inmost recesses of private friendship, he would, most likely, have defended himself by urging these obvious truths. The public, however, must be carefully blinded against every-day realities. It is to see only the patriot or the saint.

Morton's title to one or both of these captivating appellations was to be substantiated by a secret mission from the Pope to his native country. He appears to have landed on the Lincolnshire coast[3]; whence, probably, he went directly to his relations in the adjoining

---

and published out of Italy, in the life of *Pius Quintus*, concerning his Holiness' endeavours, stirred-up. by false suggestions to joyn with the king of Spain: for the utter ruine and overthrow both of our Prince and Country. Would to God, such things had never been enterprised, and most of all that they had never been printed." —*Imp. Cons.* 56.

[1] STRYPE. *Memorials.* iii. 478. DODD. ii. 194.

[2] STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. 578. Morton was appointed one of the Roman penitentiaries. Sanders describes him as "*S. Theol. Doct.* unum ex presbyteris, qui pœnitentiis indicendis Romæ præerant." —*De Vis. Mon.* 730.

[3] Morton seems to have come over at other times since his exile. Grimsby and Boston were the ports that he used.—STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. 579.

county. Another priest, named Webb, was associated with him[1]. These emissaries were to communicate with certain individuals of some distinction, who are merely designated as *illustrious and Catholic.* A treasonable correspondence, therefore, had already been opened, and the papal agents were to seek immediate interviews with known conspirators. Their message was *to denounce Elizabeth, by apostolic authority, as a heretic, and hence fallen from all dominion and power that she usurped over Catholics: who might, accordingly, treat her as a heathen and a publican, refusing obedience to her laws or mandates*[2].

This was intelligible enough; but still such language might be no more than a vent for the impotent rage of doting and malicious intolerance. Pius discovered no such weakness. Philip was lured into the confederacy by representations of its tendency to cement his own power over the Netherlands. Bigot as he was, this probably weighed with him quite as much as the anticipated pleasure of imposing Popery upon England. France was reminded of her interest in crippling a near neighbour and ancient rival; especially at a time when domestic Protestantism was occasioning the most formidable embarrassments. The Pontiff himself seems to have grown delirious. He talked as if a helmet would become him rather than the tiara. He was willing to go in person, and prepared for any sacrifice. He would pawn all the property of the apostolic see, even including chalices, crosses, and his own vestments. His agent, Ridolfi, was immediately furnished with a credit for one hundred and fifty thousand crowns. Still more was promised. So that no Englishman, ripe for bloodshed, was left under fears of wanting the sinews of war[1]. The principal nobleman in England, and one of the richest in Europe, Thomas Howard, duke of Norfolk, educated by Foxe, the martyrologist, was a confirmed Protestant. But unhappily for himself he had become, for the third time, a widower. His alleged heresy was overlooked, and Pius admitted him as a correspondent. He might be tempted with a throne, by means of Mary, queen of Scots. By papal agents the temptation was tried, and succeeded. Mary's own agent in London, Lesley, bishop of Ross, entered actively into the conspiracy, under cover of his diplomatic character[2]. The duke of Alva found conveniently commercial difficulties between England and the Netherlands, demanding an early settlement. He sent Vitelli, marquis of Cetona, to arrange them at the English court. This agent, however, was no mere civilian, but an experienced soldier, who talked of commerce with Elizabeth's ministers, and of treason with others of her subjects. His real business was to watch the movements of rebellion with a military eye, and to be ready for commanding an expedition against England, then under clandestine preparation in the Low Countries[1].

---

[1] *Imp. Cons.* 60. The author, William Watson, cites Sanders as his authority.

[2] SANDERS. *De Vis. Mon.* 730. The passage is cited and translated in Lord Burghley's *Execution of Justice*, (p. 16,) and elsewhere. "Dr. Nicholas Morton, formerly a prebendary of York, had visited the northern counties in the spring of this year. He came from Rome with the title of apostolical penitentiary. The object of his mission appears to have been to impart to the Catholic priests, as from the Pope, those faculties and that jurisdiction which they could no longer receive in the regular manner from their bishops. Cambden says, that he urged the northern gentlemen to rebellion, and had been sent to inform them that the pontiff had deposed the queen, on account of heresy; but he could only inform them that a bull of deposition was in preparation; for it was not signed or published till the next year. Of his activity, however, in promoting the insurrection, there can be little doubt. The Nortons and Markenfields were his relatives. His father and Markenfield's father had married two sisters."—LINGARD. viii. 52. note.

---

[1] The whole passage, establishing these facts, is translated from Catena, in Cambden, Bishop Carleton's *Thankful Remembrance*, and elsewhere. Cambden adds, "Thus far Hieronymo Catena; some of which things were unknown to the English, till he published them in his book printed at Rome, with the privilege of Sixtus V. in the year 1588." 442. Mr. Turner (*Mod. Hist. Engl.* iv. 227,) has transcribed, in his notes, the Italian original. Fuenmayor says of Pius, "Prometia animando a los conjurados, de ir in persona, y de vender toda la plata de las yglesias."—*Vida y Hechos de Pio V.* 112.

[2] Dodd ridiculously declares the project of Norfolk's marriage with Mary, an unprincipled stratagem of Elizabeth's advisers for his ruin. He says, it was "fraudulently projected by the English ministry, as an effectual means to ruin the duke."—*Ch. Hist.* ii. 36.

Had Pius no character at stake but that of ability for intrigue, he would have earned all the praise that Italian and Spanish bigotry so ingenuously bestow. Numerous as were his agents, such a veil of secresy shrouded all their acts, that Elizabeth's habitual vigilance was long completely baffled. At length, suspicion was aroused, and parties indicated, from whom some serious blow was daily to be feared. Ridolfi was arrested, while the hundred and fifty thousand crowns, inconsistently furnished by the most conspicuous of Christian ministers to raise a civil war, were still undisbursed. Very little information had, however, been gained. Hence the crafty Florentine was quickly set at large. His business hardly felt the temporary shock. English dealings with him immediately resumed all their old activity, and the Pope's large remittance found its way to those who had promised an acknowledgment in sanguinary violence[2].

Though Elizabeth knew scarcely anything of the formidable plot against her, she took at once the precaution of removing to Windsor Castle. She seems to have thought herself menaced with little more than a dangerous intrigue, for the marriage of Norfolk with

[1] CAMBDEN. *Eliz.* 421.

[2] STRYPE. *Annals.* i. pt. 2, p. 220.

Mary, queen of Scots. To stay its progress, she desired that noblemen to wait upon her directly. This unwelcome summons might soon have been obeyed, for the duke was at Howard House. He answered it, however, by representing himself under apprehension of an ague fit, and afraid of venturing abroad prematurely, because taking medicine for his relief[1]. Hence he requested indulgence for four days. These did not elapse, without showing him capable of a much longer journey than Windsor. He left London for his own castle of Kenninghall, in Norfolk. Thence he wrote another letter to Cecil, feigning uneasiness about his health, and promising appearance at court within a week[2]. To the queen he complained pathetically of lying under suspicion, an unmerited misfortune, that gave him "a nipping to the heart[3]." With her usual decision, Elizabeth answered all this hypocrisy, by a peremptory command for his immediate attendance[1], even if he could only travel in a litter[2]. He delayed obedience to the last moment; and then, oppressed with just alarm, set off for Windsor. There he found but little of the conspiracy detected: enough, however, to warrant his committal to the Tower.

---

[1] "I recevyd your lettres yesternight, whereby I understande that hyr Majestie will come to Wyndesor, whether hyr Plesure is I shuld repayre. At my coming hyther, I found myself disposed to an Agew, to avoyde the which I toke a Purgation yesterday, which continewed working even this Night in my Bedd. Wherfor, I am afrayde to go into the Ayer so sone; but within four dayes, I will not fayle (God willing) to come to the Corte accordingly."—The Duke of Norfolk to my Lord Leicester, or Mr. Secretary Cecill. Howard House, Sept. 22, 1569. *Collection of State Papers, left by W. Cecill, Lord Burghley:* by S. HAYNES, A.M. Lond. 1740. p. 527.

[2] "My heartie desire is, that yow will geave her Highnes to understand therof," (the ague,) "and withall to make my true and humble excuse to her Majestie on my behalfe: Assuring yow, that so sone as I may, without perill of farther sicknes, (which I trust her Highnes wolde not wishe me to encrease by over sodayne journey,) I shall, according to my bounden Deuty, wayte upon her Majestie, and that before Mondaye or Tewsday next at the farthest."—The Duke of Norfolk to Secretary Cecill. Kenynghall, Sept. 1569. *Ib.* 528.

[3] "It was no small Greyf unto me that every Townesman could saye that my Howse was besette: A nyppinge to my Harte! that I which knowe my none fidelitie to your Majestie, shoulde nowe become a suspectid Parson."—The Duke of Norfolk to the Quenes Majestie. Kenynghall, Sept. 24, 1569. *Ib.* 528.

Orders to appear in the royal presence were also received by Norfolk's father-in-law, Henry Fitz-Alan, last earl of Arundel, of that ancient house; John, lord Lumley; and William Herbert, earl of Pembroke[3]. All obeyed instantly, and seemingly disclosed, without reserve, everything needful for the public tranquillity. They admitted privity to Norfolk's intended match, but kept a strict and ingenious silence upon all points unknown to the government[4]. The bishop of Ross was likewise interrogated, but with no greater success[5].

---

[1] "We have receaved your Lettres by Delivery of the same to us by our Counsell: fynding by the same, that uppon the pretence of a feare, without cause, yow are gone to Kenynghall, contrary to our expectation, which was, that as yow wrote to certayn of our Counsell from London, not past four dayes, that yow wold without fayle be at our Court within four dayes. But now we will, that as yow intend to shew your self a faythfull Subject, as yow write yow ar, yow forthwith without any Delaye, upon the sight of these our Lettres, and without any manner of excuse, whatsoever it be, doo speedily repayre to us here at this our Castell of Wyndsor, or wheresoever we shall be."—The Quenes Majestie to the Duke of Norfolk. Sept. 25, 1569. *Burghley Papers*, 529.

[2] "Because we think yow can not be ignorant of the departure of the Duk of Norfolk from London, at such tyme as he had promised to come hyther, since which tyme, he being sent for by our servant, Edward Garret, hath made excuse of some stey by reason of a fever; and yet that he will come within few days: We have thought good to impart unto yow, that we do not allow of this excuse, and therfor have eftsones commanded hym to come up, though he be by his fever, constrayned to come in a Lytter."—The Quenes Majestie to the Lord Wentworth. *Ib.* 533.

[3] *Ib.* 529, 530.

[4] *Ib.* 535.

[5] *Ib.* 544.

Rarely has a partial discovery of extensive mischief appeared less prelusive of total failure.

Peremptory messages were sent likewise into the north, requiring Thomas Percy, earl of Northumberland, and Charles Neville, earl of Westmoreland, to show themselves with all expedition before their sovereign[1]. The latter peer was of debauched habits, as embarrassed circumstances, and a broken constitution, bore melancholy witness[2]. Northumberland, a good-natured, well-intentioned man, had been exasperated by the queen's exercise of her prerogative, in granting away from himself, a copper-mine found upon his estate. Both noblemen had great hereditary influence in their part of England, and recent years had increased it, most of the northern population sharing in their partiality for Romanism. They were, no doubt, among the *illustrious and Catholic* persons, to whom Morton bore commission from the pope. But although preparing to follow the sanguinary counsel, given so unworthily, under a religious mask, they were not ready for the blow. Ridolfi had not yet remitted the necessary supplies. No tidings had arrived of men, and other warlike appliances, expected from Scotland, or of an expedition secretly preparing in the Netherlands, which was to land at Hartlepool. Confounded by the royal mandate, while so fearfully unprepared for disobedieene, Northumberland's yielding disposition all but made him set out for Windsor. More artful conspirators, in dismay, suborned a servant, on the very day in which he heard from court, to rouse him with a midnight cry, that some neighbours, with whom he was at feud, were about his park in formidable strength. He was told, besides, that bells were ringing backwards, all the country round, signals of a holy war, then about to raise every Romish sword in England; and he was earnestly implored not to betray himself, his friends, or the faith of his noble ancestors. Bewildered and panic-stricken, he rushed from bed, and hastened to a lodge within his park. He was then at Topcliff. In the next night, he withdrew to the earl of Westmoreland's, at Brandspeth. He there found a knot of conspirators, whose desperation would hear no longer of delay. The incendiary Morton redoubled his activity, and Pius was quickly gladdened by news from England of a civil war[1].

---

[1] Copy of the Quenes Majesties Lettre to Thearles of Westmorland and Northumberland. Windsor, Nov. 10, 1569. *Ib.*

[2] *Execution of Justice*, 3.

The nation had now enjoyed eleven peaceful, prosperous, bloodless years. It is grievous to find piety made a cloak for interrupting its even, beneficial course. The two northern earls appeared in arms, proclaiming a design to restore the ancient religion. They wrote urgently to the pope, requesting further pecuniary aid: a petition answered favourably, but too late[2]. Marching onwards to Durham, they entered the minster, where they tore and destroyed all the English Bibles and Prayer Books but one. The communion-table they defaced, rent, and broke in pieces. A proclamation then was read in the queen's name, prohibiting any service until further orders, and claiming a sufficient authority for all that had been done[1]. In other places, they restored mass[2]. Among their colours were depicted chalices, and the five wounds of Christ. A cross also was borne aloft by Richard Norton, an aged gentleman[3], who was, probably, uncle to Morton, the pope's commissioned incendiary[4].

---

[1] Cambden. *Eliz.* 412. Stowe. 662. "It is true that the people of the north of England were then in a state of greater ignorance, and more inclined to Popery, than those of the midland and southern parts; but this was not all; there still remained in those parts a much greater feeling of clanship than in any other part of England. If we examine into the history of the different families who took a part in the rebellion, we shall find that, perhaps without an exception, they were all allied by blood or intermarriage with the two families of the Percies and the Nevilles, and the cause with which chiefly they identified themselves, was that of the earls who had called them into the field."—Wright's *Queen Elizabeth and her Times.* Lond. 1838. Introd. xxxiv.

[2] Their letter was dated Nov. 8. The reply of Pius bears date, Feb. 20, 1570. It speaks of the earls as "inspired" to endeavour "to deliver themselves and that kingdom from the basest servitude of a woman's lust." In another place, it speaks of them as living "basely and ignominiously to serve the will of an impotent woman." This, perhaps, is only ill-tempered nonsense: but in a letter

---

to Philip II., of March 5, 1570, the pontiff describes Elizabeth as "a most infamous woman, who considers herself queen of this province, and exercises a most cruel tyranny." Of all the acts of cruelty, ultimately charged by Romanists upon the subject of this abuse, not one had hitherto been committed. It is no wonder, therefore, that Pius could afterwards designate the queen as "a most nefarious woman, and a dishonour of all Christendom," and say, that "she had despoiled the Queen of Scots of her kingdom." (MENDHAM'S *Pius V.* 130. CATENA. 249.) Fuenmayor, accordingly, denounces Elizabeth as an usurper. Speaking of Mary, Queen of Scots, he says, "A ella la dezianque pertenecia, no a la possedora, bastarda de Henrique VIII. avida en Ana Bolena, su concubina, y por esso excluida de la succession por los leyes."—*Vida y Hechos de Pio V.* 111.

[1] Sir George Bowes to the Earl of Sussex. Nov. 10, 1569. *Queen Eliz. and her Times*, i. 332.

[2] "They" re-established the mass at Ripon, Nov. 18. (LINGARD. viii. 54.) This had been previously done at Darlington, where one of the insurgent gentlemen, "with a staffe, drove before him the poor folks to hasten them to heare the same." (Sir George Bowes to the Earl of Sussex. Nov. 17, 1569. *Queen Eliz. and her Times*, i. 336.) This zealous admirer of mass was John Swinburne, of Chopwell, Durham, afterwards attainted. His conduct renders it probable that northern affection for Romanism has been overrated.

[3] CAMBDEN. *Eliz.* 422.

[4] Nicholas Morton's father appears to have taken for a second wife, the sister of this venerable esquire. (STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. 578.) Richard Norton was of Norton Conyers, in Yorkshire. He married Susanna, daughter to Richard Neville, lord Latimer, by whom he had a very numerous family. Nine sons followed him in this unhappy rebellion; the eldest, Francis, unwillingly. Hence, probably, the favour that he received, being

Proceeding onwards, the rebels reached Clifford Moor, by Wetherby, in Yorkshire. Elizabeth's force was hardly equal to attack them, especially as the north was generally favourable to their cause. The gentry stood aloof, and professed loyalty. But rich men make bad revolutionists, and the royal commanders well knew the hollowness of much that fell upon the ear[1]. Beyond the Humber, a different disposition prevailed, as the insurgent earls became mournfully sensible. Hence they neither could see anything but ruin in a farther advance, nor any prospect of resisting the force marching from the south, until joined by their continental friends. They retreated, accordingly, to Raby, chief seat of Lord Westmoreland, and there waited anxiously for the landing of Alva's promised expedition, at the neighbouring port of Hartlepool[2]. Finding this balk their hopes, consternation became irresistible, and they fled in straggling companies, to the neighbourhood of Carlisle. Thence, the two miserable earls withdrew clandestinely into Scotland[3]. Westmore-

---

enabled to save part of the family estates. The father escaped into Flanders.

[1] "I fynde the gentilmen of this countrey, though the most parte of them be well affected to the cause which the rebells make colour of their rebellion, yet in outwarde shew, well affected to serve your majestie trewly against them, and yett I see no suche cause as I may be utterly voyde of suspicion towards them, and therefore it is wisdom to be furnished with such force as your majestie may be assured of, which will the rather inforce them to serve trewly, though they had any meaning to the contrary. The doubte and suspicion concevyd of them by my lorde of Sussex, not without vehement and good cause, hathe moche troubled his lordship."—Sir Rafe Sadler to the Quenes Majestie. Nov. 26, 1569. *State Papers and Letters of Sir Ralph Sadler.* Edinb. 1809. ii. 43.

[2] "The records at Simancas shew, that Alva always dissuaded Philip from sending aid to the discontented in England."—LINGARD. viii. 55. note.

[3] "Their unfortunate followers in England felt the whole weight of the royal vengeance. All who possessed lands or chattels were reserved for trial, that the forfeitures consequent upon their

land made good his escape, by passing over into the Netherlands; where he struggled through his latter days, upon a slender pension from the king of Spain[1]. He strove to earn his pittance by furnishing facilities to such as conspired against his country's tranquillity: which service, ill-paid as it was, rendered him daily more odious, wretched, and contemptible. Northumberland's fate, though violent and untimely, was less dishonourable. After a brief and precarious refuge among banditti, within the Scottish border, he became prisoner to the regent, Murray. His place of confinement was the celebrated castle of Lochleven, where he led a life of extreme devotion[2], until Morton came to the head of Scottish affairs. The new regent was indebted so largely to

---

attainders, might indemnify the Queen for the expenses of the campaign: the poorer classes were abandoned to the execution of martial law; and between Newcastle and Wetherby, a district of sixty miles in length, and forty in breadth, there was not a town or village, in which some of the inhabitants did not expire on the gibbet. The survivors were pardoned, but on condition, that they should take not only the oath of allegiance, but also that of supremacy." (LINGARD. 59.) "Threescore and six petty constables were hanged up at Durham, for an example, and among them the most noted mutineer was one Plumtree, a priest. At York were executed Simon Digby, J. Fulthorpe, Thomas Bishop, Robert Peneman; and a few months after, at London, Christopher and Thomas Norton; and some others in other places." (CAMBDEN. 423.) This undoubtedly, admits a great sacrifice of life, though not a greater than was to be expected in such an age. As for forfeitures to "indemnify the Queen," she had, probably, no regular resources to meet a great unusual expense, and it was more fair that the turbulent causes of the outlay should be made to pay for it, than that the industry, or incomes of peaceable men should be taxed for the purpose.

[1] CAMBDEN. 422.

[2] He remained on his knees in prayer, whole days, and often great part of the night. If meat were brought him on a fast-day, as it often was, he ate only bread, and in every particular he made his imprisonment an ascetic preparation for that violent death, in which he must have ever seen it likely to end.—BRIDGEWATER. *Concertatio Eccl. Cath.* Aug. Trev. 1589. f. 46.

English influence for his elevation, that he could hardly refuse to surrender the misguided earl. But it was an ignominious price, and rendered more so by English gold. This completed Morton's infamy in delivering to certain death one whom, during exile, he had himself found a most valuable friend[1]. Elizabeth might seem vindictive in requiring her unhappy subject, had not two years, elapsed since his rebellion, revealed an embarrassing extent of treachery and peril. Hence it appeared advisable to make an example of Northumberland, and he was beheaded, at York, in 1572[2].

While the two earls were yet in arms, one of their confederates, Leonard, second son of the late, William, Lord Dacre, of Gillesland, was at court. His nephew, George, Lord Dacre, a mere youth, had been recently killed at Thetford, in learning to vault; the wooden machine, called the *great horse*, having fallen upon him. He left sisters co-heiresses of the family honours and estates. This abeyance and partition, although legally attendant upon a barony by writ, occasioned extreme soreness in Leonard Dacre. He could not bear to smart as a younger brother any longer, having been thus unexpectedly tantalized by a nearer approach to the hereditary prize. While brooding over schemes to escape from the gripe of penury and dependance, the northern rebellion prematurely broke out. Fearful of losing a share in the anticipated spoil, he expressed abhorrence of the insurgents, and earnestly requested permission to join the force against them. He was not gratified, until his northern friends were on their way to Scotland. Even then he could not abandon his mad enterprise. Under pretence of securing his own estate, and resisting the rebels, he drew around him three thousand men, chiefly *banditti* from the borders. Henry Carey, Lord Hunsdon, cousin-german to the queen, was unable to defeat him, without great loss of life. Dacre himself, though personally deformed, fought with unyielding courage. When the battle was lost, he fled into Scotland, and thence beyond sea. He died at Louvaine, in very straitened circumstances[1].

---

[1] "But who has ever proved grateful to men in adversity?"—CAMBDEN. 445.

[2] He died with a zealous profession of Romanism on his lips. According to the unhappy fashion of his time, he was persecuted on the scaffold with Protestant admonitions. These he aggravated by his own indiscretion, professing his constancy to the universal Church, and that he knew nothing of the new Church of England. His officious Protestant adviser said, "I see you die an obstinate Papist, not a member of the Catholic Church, but of the Roman." This produced an altercation, which Northumberland ended by turning to the people, and saying, "Beware, dearest brethren, of these ravening wolves, who come to you in sheep's clothing, though they are the very men that devour your souls." The Protestant "pseudo-propheta" instantly went down from the scaffold "velut percussus." (BRIDGEWATER. f. 48.) He probably saw the inutility and cruelty of urging the dying peer any farther, and therefore left him to the only devotions that his spirit could bear unruffled.

The failure of these rebellious movements galled Rome with bitter disappointment[2]. It awakened no remorse, no shame, no suspicion of hopes incommensurate with means. The papal courtiers merely sought a cause for their discomfiture. English fugitives found one in the backwardness of Pius himself. Doubts had been thrown, they said, by the northern gentry, upon their obligation to rise against Elizabeth. Her disqualification for the throne had not been pronounced with sufficient precision and solemnity, to overcome scruples upon allegiance[3].

---

[1] CAMBDEN. 423, 408. STOWE. 662. DODD. ii. 38.

[2] "Pio con excessivo dolor oyò estas nuevas."—FUENMAYOR. 113.

[3] "Reliquis Catholicis, propterea quod adhuc per Papam non erat publice contra Reginam lata excommunicationis sententia, nec

The senseless and indecent fulmination of Paul III. against Henry VIII. not only pretends to disinherit all his issue by Anne Boleyn, but also to render them incapable of restitution[1]. Elizabeth was likewise included, although not expressly, in the excommunication that annually disgraced Rome, on Maundy Thursday. More plainly still did she come under the lash of a damnatory bull published by Paul IV., and formally confirmed by the reigning pope. This explosion of childish and uncharitable arrogance declares all princes, who maintain the sufficiency of Scripture, hopelessly deprived of their dominions[2]. As, in addition to these documentary arguments for civil war, Morton and Webb were armed with a confirmatory message from Pius himself, their eloquence must have proved highly palatable in houses pervaded by Romish prejudice, or political disaffection. The duty of deposing a sovereign labouring under such incapacity, would be warmly maintained. Confident hopes would be expressed of a general rising to drive her from the helm. Females and young men are liable to be wrought up, under such exciting doses, into a fever of enthusiasm. They soon talk loudly of the most heroical sacrifices. But heat in the members generates coolness in the head. A family threatening war and martyrdom gives intensity to the master's gaze, upon his handsome home, and plentiful estate. He dreads the storm that may sweep these advantages away. His mind may even be crossed by strong suspicions, and ancient proverbs, forbidding calculation upon domestic affection undiminished, under

---

ab ejus ipsi absoluti viderentur obedientia, se non adjungentibus." — SANDERS. *De Schism. Angl.* 310.

[1] *Damn. et Excom. Henr. VIII.* sect. 9.

[2] BISHOP BARLOW'S *Brutum Fulmen.* Lond. 1689. p. 171.

inability to continue habitual comforts. Thus incipient approval rapidly glides into evasion, and a promising discussion ends in a dogged array of reasons for standing aloof. The externals of this vexatious process were, no doubt, reported correctly to Pius. Undeniable informality in his appeal, was an obvious plea for masking unwillingness to risk the well-appointed hall, with its teeming acres.

Though the real counteracting force was palpable, and unlikely to lose its efficacy, Roman self-love and anger were easily lured into a belief, that an anathema, denounced with due solemnity, would render English gentlemen careless of everything but obedience to pontifical authority. Hence, a fresh document, confirming some of the gravest objections to Romanism, appeared on the 25th of April. Uninstructed by the contempt and odium, that alone resulted from his predecessor's bull for deposing Henry VIII., Pius hurled a like firebrand against Elizabeth. She is treated in this disgraceful instrument, as merely *the pretended queen of England*, and mentioned with a coarseness that bespeaks the gentleman, quite as little as the Christian. Her enemy has not, however, shown himself without worldly cunning. The recital of her calls upon his vengeance, opens with a charge, that "she hath removed the royal council, consisting of the English nobility, and filled it with obscure men, being heretics." In a similar spirit, one object alleged by the two northern earls, was "to prevent the encroachments of upstarts upon the ancient nobility of England[1]." Certain great families, challenging power and patronage as their birthright, were bent upon seizing them, at any hazard. Pius artfully headed his accusations by a solemn approval of their claim. Party leaders being thus fortified in selfishness, provision was next made for working upon the bigotry and ignorance of their tools. The queen had "oppressed embracers of the Catholic faith, preferred impious preachers, ministers of iniquity; abolished the sacrifice of the mass, prayers, fastings, distinction of meats, and Catholic rites; commanded books to be read in the whole realm, containing manifest heresy, impious mysteries and institutions, by herself entertained and observed according to the prescript of Calvin, to be likewise observed by her subjects; presumed to eject bishops, rectors, and other Catholic priests from their churches, consigning them to prison; compelled abjuration of the Roman pontiff, and a recognition of herself, under oath, as sole mistress both in temporals and spirituals[1]." For these provocations Elizabeth was to be deprived, and the nation absolved from all obedience, or allegiance to her.

---

[1] CAMBDEN. 422. "The two Earles yesterday passed to Richmond, and there made proclamation, which, because of the difference of reports in some parts, I omitte to advertise, and the rest was, that where there was certain councelers cropen in abowte the Prince which had excluded the nobility from the Prince, and had

Undoubtedly, the absurdity of this bull keeps pace with its malignity. But notwithstanding, it was formed for urging individuals into guilt and suffering. The delirious presumption of Pius has, accordingly, furnished many a melancholy page, written in characters of blood[2].

---

set suche lawe contrary to the honor of God and the welthe of the realme, which they meant to reforme."—Sir George Bowes to the Earl of Sussex. Nov. 17, 1569. *Queen Elizabeth and her Times.* i. 333.

[1] Bishop Barlow's *Brutum Fulmen.* 4. "The principal persons, whose importunity solicited the Pope to thunder out this excommunication, were Dr. Harding, Dr. Stapleton, Dr. Morton, and Dr. Webb." (Fuller. *Ch. Hist.* 95.) Watson treats those who procured this bull as men who imposed upon the pope by false representations.

[2] "This their traiterous endeavour," (in procuring the bull),

Statesmen, taking general views, might look upon his wretched parchment with scorn, or pity. Religious enthusiasm, political discontent, professional ambition, or even the necessity of seeking a subsistence, were certain to find in it a call, or a cloak, for periling life and public tranquillity. This pope has, therefore, fully earned the execration of posterity. Yet so thoroughly does infatuation blend itself with artifice, in everything purely papal, that later years have seen Pius canonised[1]. Such a distinction, unquestionably, harmonises with his political assumptions. The Roman bishops first undertook to dispense with civil allegiance, when self-interest impelled them to a decided compromise with falling Paganism[2]. Of that popular system, so artfully prolonged in its less offensive features by their policy, invocation of the dead

---

"for I can terme it no better, aimed at nothing but blood, crueltie, and destruction, not onely of the soveraigne, but an infinite number besides. For they could not be so absurde as to thinke that the said excommunication was ever like to take effect, without either warre, or treacherie. Nay, it is now plaine, that they had then plotted in their harts a shameful rebellion, which they did sollicite, some of them in person, as soon as the Pope had satisfied their desire."—WATSON'S *Decacordon of Quodlibetical Questions concerning Religion and State.* 1602. p. 262.

[1] May 22, 1712. MENDHAM'S *St. Pius V.* 229. This pope, who seems to have lived without hypocrisy, greatly as he sinned against mercy and charity, died May 1, 1572, aged sixty-eight. A Dominican friary for the place of his education, religious principles compounded of Paganism and Christianity, and the best of his years employed in the Inquisition, appear to have formed an odds against substantial excellence, with which his mental powers were wholly unequal to cope. Nature had not formed him for a great man. But he might have been an exemplary Christian, had he been spared the contagion of his instructors, tenets, and occupations. His actual appearance as a religious chief, was rather that of a *Pontifex maximus* under Nero, than that of a Christian patriarch.

[2] "Hic" (Gregorius III.) "statim ubi pontificatum iniit, cleri Romani consensu, Leonem tertium imperatorem Constantinopolitanum *imperio* simul et communione fidelium *privat*, quod sanctas imagines e sacris ædibus abrasisset et statuas demolitus esset, quodque etiam de homusio male sentiret."—PLATINA. *De Vit. Pontiff.* 88.

seems to have been the origin, and has ever been a prominent characteristic[1].

To Romish families in England, the pope's bull was very far from generally acceptable. Some few applauded it, as a noble proof of resolution; the grave, or cautious, only sought reasons to disregard it. Nothing could look more like an imposition, originating with Protestants, to render Romanism odious. The majority, however, did not venture upon ground so palpably untenable. Such as distinguished between papal policy, and Romish doctrines, denied validity to excommunications of princes and multitudes. For the soundness of this denial, they cited Aquinas. But interest and passion refuse popularity to a view so manly. Disapprobation, therefore, fastened more extensively upon unseasonableness and inexpediency. The queen might be exasperated, rather than alarmed, and promising hopes be nipped in the bud, because Rome was rash. Quibbling minds, partial to Popery, but shy of peril, took refuge under the impossibility of seeing the document itself. It might not be correctly copied, or even promulged at all, with requisite solemnity. Plainer men felt perplexing doubts as to any foreign interference with natural allegiance. Others pleaded scholastic authority for disobeying a call to rebel, hopelessly endangering life and fortune[1].

---

[1] These facts are solidly established at great length, in FABER'S *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*. Cudworth remarks that some of the ancient heathens understood all the gods but one, as nothing else than "understanding beings superiour to men." (*Intell. Syst.* Lond. 1678. p. 209.) In another place, (276,) he thus translates the Pagan Longimanus to St. Austin: "We come to the Supreme God, by the minor, or inferior gods." Again, he says, "For which cause, the Pagan sacrifices, are by way of contempt, in the Scripture, called *the sacrifices of the dead*, (Ps. cvi. 28,) that is, not of *dead, or lifeless statues*, as some would put it off, but of *dead men*." (226.) The gods, therefore, of Paganism, have ever been strictly analogous to the saints of Romanism. The peculiarities of the latter system are, in fact, little else than a Christianized modification of the former. Rome papal is chiefly indebted for importance, to the mitigated, but prolonged existence that she has given to Rome pagan.

Care for these gave the queen an impregnable citadel. There are a few, however, in all communities, who can see nothing but visions of their own heated brains. By some such hasty spirits, a tumult was raised in Norfolk, leading to the execution of three gentlemen, but nationally unimportant[2]. An outbreak that made more noise all over Europe, was committed in London. John Felton, by birth a gentleman[3], had been notorious for political disaffection, and Romish fanaticism, during the whole of Elizabeth's reign. Both foreign and domestic enemies to the public tranquillity had sought his confidence, and found him ready for any desperate enterprise[4]. At length, he fell into the hands of a Catalan, named Peter Berga, prebendary of Tarragona, and chaplain to the

---

[1] WATSON'S *Quodlibets*, p. 262. The author says that his namesake, the deprived bishop, was particularly displeased by this bull, which he represents as extorted from the pope by false suggestions. "Bishop Watson was exceedingly grieved, when he heard that *Pius Quintus* had been drawn to that course, as in his wisedome seeing the great inconveniences of it."—*A Decacordon of Quodlibetical Questions concerning Religion and State.* p. 260.

[2] CAMBDEN. 428.

[3] STRYPE. *Annals.* iii. Append. XXXVIII. p. 495.

[4] "Cum nemo omnium per totos undecim annos, in nostra republica, seditiosus civis fuerit, qui non omnia rationis suæ concilia cum Feltono communicaret, cum apud exteros nationes nemo patriæ nostræ hostis esset, quin illius ope, tanquam organo apprime necessario, uteretur, cum semper in insidiis, in speculis, in conjurationibus esset, cum bonis infestus esset, malis vero, rumoribus, literis, nuntiis, animos adderet, cum Principem clementissimam summo odio insectaretur, cum Papæ tyrannidem et imperium servile vehementer desideravit; id divino judicio factum est, ut Papæ fulmen ita Feltono in gremium incideret, ut illi mortem inferret, quod ille sine sensu, sine ratione tantopere suspiciebat." (*Fidelis Servi Subdito Infideli Responsio.* Lond. 1573.) This tract, which is unpaged, may be considered as an official answer to Sanders, *De Vis Mon.*

Spanish ambassador. He persuaded him to post up in London, the pope's incendiary bull. The day, chosen for this insane defiance, saw the same insult offered to Elizabeth, in Paris. The paper there was torn down by a servant attached to the English embassy. Walsingham, one of the ambassadors, who, with his coadjutor, Lord Buckhurst, took it indignantly to court, warned the king against connivance at a license likely to recoil upon himself[1]. It was the festival of Corpus Christi, deemed most solemn in Romish countries, and greeted by a pageant highly offensive to Protestant apprehensions. Minds captivated by such a show, would naturally think the day peculiarly appropriate for hurling papal firebrands. Felton fixed the bull upon the gate of the bishop of London's palace. There it remained all night, unobserved, as it seems, by the inmates, but many read it, and some even translated it.

The Spanish tempter promptly fled[2]. Like him arose a succession of men, equally skilful in finding martyrs, as the more unfortunate of their dupes were cajolingly called, and in avoiding any such distinction themselves. Disdaining flight, the English tool was taken, glorying in his deed, and on the fourth of August, he was convicted, at Guildhall, of treason, under the ancient common law of England. He met the barbarous penalty provided for that offence, with a fortitude worthy the best of causes[1]. He seems, indeed, to have laboured long under a morbid impatience for death, and only to have waited for an opportunity of obtaining what a disordered imagination painted as the crown of martyrdom. His act was, however, strongly disapproved by the great bulk of English Romanists[2].

---

[1] Strype (*Annals.* ii. 24) erroneously assigns this transaction to March 2, nearly two months before the date of the bull itself. Ribadeneyra assigns Felton's act, with which the Paris posting synchronised, to Corpus Christi day, June 2. Stowe's date is May 25. Bartoli says, "Giovanni Feltono, gentilhuomo Inglese, che il solennissimo dì del Corpus Christi havea publicata in Londra la sopradetta scommunica."—*Dell' Istoria della Compagnia di Giesu, L'Inghilterra.* p. 33.

[2] "Juan Feltono, varon noble, y de animo esforçado, el qual viendo la destruycion de su patria, y que una llaga tan encancerada no se podia curar sino con fuego, y medicina fuerte, movido de zelo de Dios, el dia del santissimo Sacramento del año de mil y quinientos y setenta, affixó la Bula impressa a la puerta de las casas del Obispo, donde estuvo hasta las ocho de la mañana del dia siguiente, y fue vista y leyda de muchos, y trasladada de algunos. Ayudo a Feltono en esta hazaña un Español, llamudo Pedro Berga, Catalan de nacion, y prebendado en la yglesia de Tarragona, el qual huyo, dexando a Juan Feltono (que no quiso huyr) en manos de los hereges." (RIBADENEYRA. *Scisma de Inglaterra.* Madr. 1588. f. 267.) Fuenmayor does not preserve the name of his prudent countryman, and blunders about that of the English sufferer. He says of the bull, "Dos zelosos Catolicos la fixaron en las puertas

Though treason was foiled in its political aims, it had now accomplished an important work. Romanism was no longer likely to disappear from England. Much of the ground gained by Protestantism, was now lost again. Many, who made no secret of Romish partialities, had hitherto come to church. They might solace a lingering regret, by an occasional mass in private houses. But they stood forward as conformists, and early prejudice was daily giving way. It received, in fact, steady encouragement from hardly any but a few deprived clergymen; who resolutely refused to countenance the English service

---

del arzobispo de Londres, donde durò algunas horas del dia, y por su occasion suffriò martirio el piadoso Juan Milela."—*Vida y Hechos de Pio V.* 112.

[1] Aug. 8. Stowe. 667. "The publishing of this bull by a subject against his sovereign (as appeareth by that which hath been oftentimes said) was treason in the highest degree, by the ancient common law of England; for if it were treason to publish a bull of excommunication against a subject thereof, as it was adjudged in the reign of King Edward I., *a fortiori*, it is treason in the highest degree to publish such a bull against the sovereign and monarch herself."—Sir E. Coke's *Reports* Lond. 1777. Cawdrey's Case.

[2] Bartoli. 33.

by their presence. Among the laity, there was very little appearance of any objection to it[1]. Yet exertions had not been wanting to arouse a very different spirit. Many of those who attended church, highly respected the Council of Trent, and well knew that some of its most eminent members had positively decided against all countenance of a service not cordially approved[2]. The reasons given for this decision were speedily imported, and circulated in print. Nor had they proved wholly inoperative. Attendance at church diminished, after the queen's first five years[1]. But this was all. There was no decisive and

---

[1] This is expressly affirmed in the queen's instructions to Walsingham, ambassador to France, dated Aug. 11, 1570. Speaking of the leading Romanists, Elizabeth says, that "they did ordinarily resort, from the beginning of her reign, in all open places, to the churches, and to divine service in the church, *without any contradiction, or shew of misliking.*" From this account of the heads of the party, Heylin fairly infers, "we may judge the like of the members also." (*Hist. Presb.* 260.) Cambden, after mentioning Felton's case, says, "Most of the moderate Papists secretly disliked the bull; because there had been no previous admonition, as justice required; and withal foresaw the storms that hung over their heads, who before securely exercised their religion within their own private houses, *or had made no scruple of frequenting the service of God, as now received in the English Church.*" (428.) "After this Bull, all they that depended on the Pope obeyed the Bull, disobeyed their gracious and natural sovereign, and upon this occasion refused to come to church."—Sir E. Coke's *Reports.* Cawdrey's Case.

[2] Although the question was agitated at Trent, before the council separated, and an answer unfavourable to Romish conformity, was given there in 1562; it is plain that little or no attention was paid to this. In fact, many of the elder English clergy, though Romishly inclined, defended occasional conformity, as not *per se malum*, the common-prayer containing "no positive heterodoxy." Had not interest and passion prevented this undeniable fact from continuing its beneficial operation, we should have known nothing of English Roman Catholics. But then, the clerical fugitives must have been awakened from delightful dreams of returning home mitred; or even of ending their days among their own countrymen, in some well-endowed parsonage. Laymen, too, must have foregone the opportunity of working upon the bigotry of an ignorant populace, in order to raise themselves into power, upon the downfall of existing ministers. Allen, therefore, wrote against occasional conformity, as "the worst sort of religious hypocrisy," asserting "that the Scriptures are very explicit in condemning any sort of religious commerce with schismatics, or heretics, and that there was manifest danger of many being seduced by the subtile arguments and misrepresentations with which Protestant pulpits abounded." (Butler's *Hist.*

Mem. iii. 147.) Thus this polemic reckoned upon forming a Romish sect in England, by means of begging the question, keeping up ignorance of Protestantism, and allowing no inexpedient knowledge of Romanism. He did not reckon without his host. A writer in the *British Magazine*, (Dec. 1, 1836, p. 658,) says of the *Declaration*, which forms the corner-stone of Romish recusancy in England, "The copy in my possession is without date, place, or printer, in a kind of square small octavo of forty pages, and the title is as follows, *The Declaration of the Fathers of the Councell of Trent concerning the going unto Churches at such time as hereticall service is saied, or heresy preached.* It is both in Latin and English, (both, I presume, of equal authority,) and is preceded by an address from the editor *To the Catholicke Reader.* From the conclusion of this address, it appears that, in the editor's belief, there were *many* copies in the realm; but he himself could *meet with but one copy, which he had lying by him these many years*, and which, for the general good, he now reprinted.

"The *Declaration* purports that the Romanists, at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, were divided in opinion, and in a difficulty respecting attendance upon the then national worship: some acquiesced, others refused: and the latter thus express themselves: they *do earnestly desire to be instructed what the desire of godly and learned men is that they ought to do: for if, without danger of soul, or without offence, it be lawful for them to obey, and conform themselves to the public decree of the kingdom, they would willingly do it. On the other side, if herein their everlasting salvation may any way be hazarded, or God's majesty offended, they have determined to suffer anything rather than do that whereby they may know God's anger to be incurred.*"

[1] "Ineunte hîc regnum Regina (exceptis aliquot de clero Mariano) non multi præterea fuerunt, qui sacris tum nostris et ritibus abstinerent. Satis hoc superque notum iis, qui per ætatem possunt adhuc prima illa Reginæ tempora recordari. Tanta quidem tum eorum paucitas, ut per aliquot lustra, *Recusantem* esse, quid sibi vellet, ignotum penitus: necdum enim nata hîc apud nos vox ipsa, vel titulus *Recusantis.* Vel ex uno etiam hoc facile id sciat, lector, numero fuisse non magno, quod silerent leges, quod nihil actum in Senatu de iis toto decennio. Fuisset autem actum lege aliqua vel senatus-consulto, nisi numero fuissent contemnendo. Intererat enim Reipubl. eos non negligere, si ad numerum tum aliquem excrevissent. Tum vero exploratum hoc, ut cum sisteretur pro tribunali reus Garnettus, hocque illi, quod modo dixi, de numero tam exiguo objec-

conspicuous secession. A serious breach had been rather threatened, than made, and no long interval, undisturbed by extraneous force, must have healed every tendency to it. Another five years glided away, leaving the great bulk of those who preferred Romanism, still worshippers in their ancestral churches. The door was then closed by politics. Men's evil passions were set on fire by Norfolk's conspiracy, the northern rebellion, the pope's bull, and Felton's outrage. Where party feelings had any tenderness for these, the Trentine reasons against conformity took immediately a powerful hold. Men thought themselves arraigned by conscience, as dissemblers. Their ancient prepossessions had been gradually yielding under the process of calm conviction. They now returned upon them, and with a violence before unknown. Mortification had unequivocally fastened on the vitals of English

---

tum esset, diffiteri non posset; id tandem diceret, *nonnullos* quidem, quos ipse vel nosset, vel sic inaudisset, a sacris nostris per id tempus abfuisse. Nec si in hac tanta regni amplitudine, abfuerunt tum *nonnulli*, momentum in eo magnum: nobis enim ad causæ caput satis, si *proluvies illa, quæ pòst fuit Recusantium, ex Pii censura, quasi ex pluvia ranæ, prognata primum ac propagata fuit.*

"Non ergo conscientia causa dicenda, vel religionis, Recusantium hîc causa apud nos. Nam si religionis, quinquennio primo Reginæ Elizabethæ, cum eadem per omnia fuit quæ nunc est religio, cur non eadem tum illis conscientia? Cur sacra tum nostra execrati non sunt? Adierunt enim tum, si non omnes, at (quod passus vel Garnettus) *plurimi.* Etiam de vestris quidam (addo et *primarii quidam*) rationes scripto divulgârunt, cur id liceret facere, etiam ut id facerent, quibusdam tum de suis authores insuper fuerunt, ut consulenda fuerit ea de re Synodus Tridentina. Quinquennio proximo, cum jam Duodecim viri illi Tridentini sententiam ea de re suam interposuissent (de non adeundo nobiscum templa) cur neque tum sacris abstinuerunt omnes? Discessio quidem ex eo facta a nonnullis: pars tamen multo maxima (sententia illa non obstante) etiam tum nobiscum assidue rem divinam audiebant. Quæro jam, cum nihil de novo mutatum tum fuerit in religione, quod ita licuit per decennium, cur anno pòst undecimo cœpit non licere?"—Bishop Andrewes. *Tortura Torti.* Lond. 1609. pp. 130, 131.

Romanism. In late events it found antiseptics, that staved off extinction. Absence from church became a party and sectarian mark. It proclaimed smart under lost political ascendancy. Thus was secured a reprieve for the relics of English Paganism. However modified and christianised by Rome, they had been all but finally uprooted from the soil of England. Ten more years might have been fatal to them. A generation wholly untinctured by their influence, would have spurned every religious principle, shrinking from contact with God's recorded word.

Romish exertions for planting a party and sect in England, exhibited some features peculiar to the time. The timid were emboldened by astrological absurdities, which limited Elizabeth's reign to twelve years. Then fate would bring *the day*, or *the golden day*, which papal partisans confidently predicted. Even the Protestant mind was not sufficiently advanced to spurn these pretended calculations. Hence the queen's thirteenth accession-day, which convicted them of folly, was celebrated as a national festival, with public thanksgiving, sermons, and unusual hilarity[1]. In 1561, London was deeply mortified by the burning of St. Paul's spire, then one of the loftiest in Europe. This was represented as a judgment for the discontinuance of those ancient services, which had been performed incessantly in some part of the cathedral, or other[2]. An anonymous zealot, who embodies this notion in a printed pamphlet, asserts that St. James, the first bishop of Jerusalem, said mass[1]. In lashing this laughable sally, the answerer gives some curious details of the superseded missal services[2]. He likewise furnishes contemporary evidence, that midnight calls to cathedral or conventual prayers were little else than taxes upon public credulity. Every wakeful ear around hung upon the solemn knell, and devout imaginations naturally kindled with pictures of the choir, filling with pious monks, or canons, to pray for slumbering sinners. Within the venerated enclosure, none started at the bell, but a few singing-boys and lads, with a bare sufficiency of men to drive them from their beds[3].

---

[1] Nov. 17. STRYPE. *Annals*. i. pt. 2. p. 354.

[2] "As in Saint Paule's Church, in London, by the decrees of blessed fathers, every night at midnight, they had mattines, and all the forenoone, masses, in the Church, with other devine service, and continuall prayer: and in the steeple, antimes and prayers were hadde certayne times: but consider howe farre nowe contrarye, the Churche has been used, and it is no marvaile yf God have sende

---

downe fire to brinne parte of the Churche as a signe of his wrath." *The Burnynge of Paule's Church in London, in the yeare of oure Lord*, 1561, *and the iiii day of June, by lyghtnynge, at three of the clocke at after-noone, which continued terrible and helplesse unto nyght.* Lond. p. 4. The tract is undated, but a copy in the British Museum has 1563 subjoined in MS.

[1] "There in Hierusalem Saint Peter converted a great multitude to the faith; which faith at Hierusalem was first taught and declared upon by a counsel of the Apostles and seniors there, Saint James being bishop, and there said masse." *Ib.* 2.

[2] "Alas! poore masse, that hais no better a groundwork to be bylte-on than false lies, and so unlearned a Proctour to speak for it! I pray you, who helpt Saint James at masse? Who hallowed hys Corporas, Superaltare, Chalice, Vestimentes, &c.? Who was deacon and subdeacon to reade the Epistle and Gospel? Who rang to the sacring, and served the Pax? For I am as sure it was a solempne feast, and that these things were done, as he is that S. James said masse. He that told you the one could have told you the other as well as this, if he had lust; and ye saye, your masse cannot be saide without these trinkettes. I praye you, what masse was it? Began it with a great R. of *Requiem*, or *Scala Coeli*, or *Resurrexi:* for the plague, or murrion of beastes: part of a trentall, or for all christen soules? If ye will have us believe it, ye must tell us some more."—*A Confutacion of an addicion, with an Apologye written and cast in the stretes of West Chester, against the causes of burnyng Paules church in London, which causes the reuerend Byshop of Duresme declared at Paules Crosse* 8 *Junii*, 1561.

[3] "In Paules and Abbayes, at their midnight prayers were none commenlye, but a fewe ballynge

Romish minds were not, however, to be deterred by such retaliatory exposures, from representing the burning of London's pride, as a visitation of offended Heaven. Hence the papal party was charged with having itself destroyed the spire, by means of magic, or some other management[1]. Allen complained of this ridiculous, but well-earnt calumny. One of his own expedients to render odious the religious policy of his country, was to awaken anticipations of endless mutability. England, he says, had formerly adopted Lutheranism, but now Calvinism[2]. Sanders ventures upon prophecy. The Turks, he tells his readers, already threaten Germany, and will reduce its inhabitants to a level with the schismatical Greeks, unless they return to the Catholic church[3]. He reckoned, probably, upon a like service for England, from his friends, the Spaniards.

A Romish sect and party was now distinctly before the country, repudiating its religion, and blemished by criminal attacks upon the public tranquillity. The go-

---

priestes, yonge queristers and nouices, whyche understode not what they said: the elder sort kept their beddes, or were woorse occupied. A prayer not understande in the hart, but spoken with the lippes, is rather to be counted praiting and balling, than prayinge with good devotion. The elder sort, both in cathedrall churches and abbaies, almost never came at their midnyghte prayer: it was thought inough to knolle the belles, and make menne beleve that they rose to praye: therefore, they have not so much to crake of this their doinge."—*A Confutacion, &c.*

[1] "Pyramis Londinensis, non nullis ab hinc annis, mirabiliter sane de cœlo tacta, conflagravit incendio furioso et inextinguibili; quis adversariorum rem non attribuit nostrorum præstigiis?"—ALLEN. *De Persecutione Anglicana.* Rom. 1582. p. 86.

[2] "Adversarii aliquando communionis nostræ, nunc arrepta fide Calvini, Lutheri projecta, nostraque contempta."—*Ib.* 30.

[3] "Turca omnium Germanorum cervicibus imminet, ac nisi ad Catholicam Ecclesiam, unde exierunt, iterum revertantur, eos omnes eadem captivitatis laqueo implicabit, quo Græcos schismaticos jamdiu involutos tenet."—*De Vis. Mon.* 591.

vernment naturally viewed it with anger and apprehension. Hence a new Parliament, assembled on the second of April, was called upon to curb it by severe enactments. One act was intended especially for the queen's protection. It was made high treason to deny her title to the throne, or to declare a preference for the title of another; or to denounce her as a heretic, schismatic, or infidel; or to maintain that law cannot regulate the succession. The preamble of another act states that simple and ignorant persons have been drawn by papal bulls, not only to forsake their churches, but also to consider themselves discharged from allegiance to the queen. Those who procured, or imported such bulls, and absolved others by virtue of them, and those who received such absolutions, were declared guilty of high treason[1]. Those who favoured such practices were to incur the penalties of a *Præmunire*. The concealment of such bulls for above six weeks, is made misprision of treason. The importation of *Agnus Deis*[2], crosses, pictures, or beads, from the Bishop of Rome, or from any one alleging his authority, was to be visited by the penalties of a *Præmunire*[3]. Such articles were treated as evidence of communication with Rome, and of acquiescence in the papal pretensions[4].

These acts were evidently justified by the ascertained necessity of providing new safeguards for life and property[1]. Hence they would pass untaxed, had Pius been merely a temporal prince. His agents, however, were preachers of rebellion; really, therefore, civil offenders of a very dangerous description. To the nature of their errand, many a scaffold, many a field, many a shattered frame, many a bereaved or plundered home, had mournfully borne unequivocal testimony. Such men have little title to national forbearance, because they are ecclesiastics, and often enthusiasts, rather than adventurers. To the bearer of a commission with riot and bloodshed on its very front, severity is indispensable. In extenuation, may be alleged Elizabeth's intolerance. But her age was inexperienced in religious liberty. Sects contended not for toleration, but for the establishment. Even, however, if Mary's barbarities could have been forgotten, the Romish party entered upon a new reign, without any sufficient claim to public patronage. Its peculiarities wanted authentication, until the Council of Trent separated: an event posterior to the queen's accession. England was, therefore, fully justified in preferring a creed already defined, at home, to one yet under examination abroad. Nor would any have long regretted exploded Romanism, had not a few clergymen, ashamed of a new recantation, and building upon the prospect of a Romish successor, withdrawn from their native land. It was the impatience of these men, under difficulties caused by their own sense of decency, or bigotry, or indiscretion, that saved English Romanism from the peaceful, but certain process of gradual extinction. Its respite has occasioned much national embarrassment and individual suffering. Elizabeth's policy, therefore, claims the praise of political sagacity. What results may flow from its unexpected failure, the world is not yet able fully to discern. But a country in which sound learning and free inquiry have long been enthroned, is peculiarly fit for the discussion of important questions. Romanism, however, known only among foreigners, would, like recent popes, have been disregarded by Englishmen. Constant presence, and occasional prominence, force its popular qualities upon their attention. It may be viewed habitually as the mere creature of ignorance, despotism, prejudice, or family pride. Bursts of unusual confidence and activity reveal other holds upon the heart of man. Thus a nation, pre-eminent for depth of thought without rashness, becomes thoroughly grounded in the exclusive claims of scriptural religion. The political institutions of England have long attracted universal and favourable observation. Instruction may hereafter widely flow from her well-considered religious convictions, her ecclesiastical polity connected with apostolic times.

---

[1] "In the construction of this act, it appears to have been understood, that the absolutions which it mentions did not denote absolutions given in sacramental confession, but those absolutions only which were granted by special faculties."—Butler's *Hist. Mem.* iii. 189.

[2] "An *Agnus Dei* was a loaf of wax, with a figure of a lamb upon it, consecrated by the Pope on Low Sunday."—Collier. *Eccl. Hist.* ii. 529.

[3] Butler. Collier, *ubi supra.*

[4] "Percio egli è un communicare con Roma, e riconoscere la podestà del Pontefice."—Bartoli. 34.

---

[1] "Now upon all these occasions, her Majesty being moved with great displeasure, called a Parliament in the thirteenth year of her reign, 1571, wherein a law was made containing many branches against the bringing into this land, after that time, of any bulls from Rome, any *Agnus Dei*, crosses, or pardons: and against all manner of persons, that should procure them to be so brought hither, with some other particularities thereunto appertaining. Which law, although we hold it to be too rigorous, and that the pretended remedy exceeded the measure of the offence, either undutifully given, or in justice to have been taken: yet, as reasonable men, we cannot but confess, that the state had great cause to make some laws against us, except they should have shewed themselves careless for the continuance of it. But be the law, as any would have it, never so extreme; yet surely it must be granted, that the occasions of it were most outragious: and likewise that the execution of it was not so tragical, as many since have written and reported of it. For whatsoever was done against us, either upon the pretence of that law, or of any other, would never, we think, have been attempted, had not divers other preposterous occasions, (besides the causes of that law) daily fallen out among us: which procured matters to be urged more severely against us."—*Imp. Cons.* 60.

CHAPTER III.

DISCIPLINARIAN CONTROVERSY.

1571—1572.

CLAMOUR AGAINST THE HIERARCHY — COMPLAINTS OF INSUFFICIENT DISCIPLINE—OBJECTIONS TO THE LITURGY — CARTWRIGHT — PURITANICAL PARTY IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—CONFERENCE OF A COMMITTEE WITH THE PRELATES—ACT FOR THE MINISTERS OF THE CHURCH TO BE OF SOUND RELIGION—ASSENT TO THE DOCTRINAL ARTICLES ONLY—CONTESTED CLAUSE IN THE TWENTIETH ARTICLE—CANONS ENACTED BY CONVOCATION—PURITANS CITED BEFORE THE HIGH COMMISSION—NORTHAMPTON REGULATIONS—PROPHESYINGS—FARTHER MOVEMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—ADMONITION TO THE PARLIAMENT—COMMITTAL OF ITS AVOWED AUTHORS—CONTROVERSY BETWEEN WHITGIFT AND CARTWRIGHT — INFLUENCE OF CARTWRIGHT—THE SEIGNORY—THE PLATFORM UNKNOWN TO THE MARIAN MARTYRS—FIRST ENGLISH PRESBYTERY.

THE menacing front lately worn by Romanism owed much to the increasing violence of Protestant dissension. Demands were no longer limited by vestures, and a few ceremonies. *Discipline* was now the cry. The Church must surrender everything but her doctrines[1]. Questions upon the ordinal parity of bishops and presbyters gave way to denial of any difference in function, rank, or dignity. Episcopacy, it was insisted, had no exclusive right of ordination, or discipline. It authorised no minister of Christ in rising above his brethren, or undertaking any duties not purely spiritual: the whole body being equally incapable of a title, a seat in Parliament, or a civil employment of any kind.

---

[1] "There was no difference in points of doctrine between the Puritans and Conformists." (NEAL. i. 213.) "This was undoubtedly true, with respect to the majority: but this history has furnished different instances of objections in point of doctrine. The established sentiments concerning the Trinity, and the person of Christ, though they did not form the grounds of that separation, of which our author writes, were yet called in question, and as we have seen in the note, p. 66, were by no means universally received. But it would not have been surprising, if in that early period of the Reformation, there had been a perfect acquiescence in every doctrinal principle that did not appear to have been peculiar to the system of Popery: for the progress of the mind and of enquiry is necessarily gradual." (*Ib.* note by the Editor.) Neal's text, and Toulmin's note, form together no contemptible justification of the queen's policy. The historian seems to have thought nothing in the way of religious peace, but the hierarchy and the liturgy, the editor considers the

The new *platform*, as the Disciplinarians called their system, denounced archdeacons, deans, and other cathedral functionaries, as unknown to Scripture, or primitive antiquity. Their precedence was, therefore, an infringement upon the privileges of ordinary presbyters.

Episcopal courts were intolerably oppressive, mere creatures of papal canon law, inconsistent with God's word, and national statutes. Their excommunications and absolutions by laymen were unwarrantable assumptions of ministerial rights.

A *godly discipline* could alone prevent indiscriminate access to the Lord's table, and general claims to communion with a church described in her own Articles as a *congregation of faithful people*. Her formularies, too, were unsatisfactory. The use of a liturgy was readily conceded: in fact, the Puritans used commonly that of Geneva. But they claimed free licence for extemporaneous prayers, both before and after sermon. The English service was faulty from frequent use of the Lord's Prayer, and of responses by the congregation. Nor was

---

overthrow of these as merely a first instalment. The public mind, he reckons, must *gradually* have become Unitarian, as the phrase runs. Elizabeth's ministers were well able to discern the tendency of certain stirring spirits towards some *gradual progress* of innovation and encroachment. Hence they chose a strong position, and steadily maintained it.

it proper to say, in the marriage office, *With my body I thee worship*, or in that for burials, over almost every corpse, *In sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life.* Nor were lessons to be read from the Apocrypha, nor ought cathedral service to continue, or the use of musical instruments in any church.

The homilies escaped objection, but ordination of any unable to preach was condemned. Loud were declamations against *dumb ministers*, pluralists, and non-residents. Individuals, exercising ecclesiastical patronage, usurped upon the rights of congregations. The pastor should be his people's choice.

The observation of saints' days, of Lent, and of other stated fasts, was unscriptural, and superstitious. Buying and selling, on the Lord's day, should no longer be suffered.

In baptism, the sign of a cross was improper, as were also the occasional administration by midwives, or other women; the use of sponsors, unless parents were dead, or in a distant country; and the answers of sponsors, in the child's name, instead of their own. Names of heathen origin, or designating any person in the Trinity, or angels, were objectionable.

The churching of women was akin to Jewish purification; confirmation might be administered too soon[1], and wore something of a sacramental aspect; kneeling at the Lord's Supper was connected with idolatrous abuse among Papists; bowing at the name of Jesus was founded upon a false interpretation of Scripture[2]; the ring in marriage was devised by Romanists to give that rite the character of a sacrament; marriage ought not to be prohibited at certain times of the year, yet then licensed for money, nor should marriage licenses be granted without knowledge of the congregation, for fear of keeping secret impediments undiscovered.

---

[1] When candidates "could repeat the Lord's prayer, and their catechism, by which they had a right to come to the Sacrament, without any other qualification: this might be done by children of five or six years old."—NEAL. i. 212.

[2] Phil. ii. 10. "Whensoever the name of Jesus shall be in any

The surplice, and certain ceremonies, professedly reserved for decency, were denied any such character, and branded as disgraces to the Reformation. Existing circumstances had rendered them absolutely unlawful. They were defiled by idolatry and superstition. Many pretended Protestants looked upon them as, in a manner, holy. Their continuance encouraged Popery, and seemed like a claim to affinity with that communion, so justly renounced. Admitted indifference even, would not justify impositions, occasioning extensive scruples, yet unwarranted by Scripture, and primitive antiquity.

To seek reformation in these particulars, the Puritans maintained, was incumbent upon every man. Ministers were to use the word, magistrates, authority, under scriptural direction, the people must urge their prayers[1].

---

lesson, sermon, or otherwise in the Church pronounced, that due reverence be made of all persons, young and old, with lowness of courtesie, and uncovering of heads of the menkind, as thereunto doth necessarily belong, and heretofore hath been accustomed." *Injunctions by Queen Elizabeth*, 1559. 52. Sparrow's *Collection*. p. 82.) The 18th canon of 1603, takes the same ground. "And likewise, when in the time of divine service, the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present, *as it hath been accustomed.*" The continuance of this *custom* seems a charitable and prudent regard for the great preponderance of national prejudice.

[1] Neal. i. 213. Report to Cecil from Cambridge, containing twenty six articles. Strype. *Annals*. i. pt. 2. p. 381. The historian of the Puritans proceeds to say, "If we add but one article more, we have the chief head of controversy between the Church of England and the Protestant Dissenters at that day, and this is: The natural right that every man has to judge for

Impatience of superiority and lust of innovation owed this mass of materials chiefly to Thomas Cartwright, a bold, eloquent, learned, and able fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. He had been originally of St. John's, and was born in Hertfordshire, in 1535[1]. He gained upon public attention about thirty, an age, which allows no contemptible acquisitions of scholarship, thought, and ascendancy over juniors, without abating energy, cooling passion, or affording a deep insight either into men or books. Ambition then is rampant, and aspiring spirits begin angrily to discern the hindrances that mock their sanguine calculations. Cartwright's youth had been se-

---

himself, and make profession of that religion he apprehends most agreeable to truth, as far as it does not affect the peace and safety of the government he lives under; without being determined by the prejudices of education, the laws of the civil magistrate, or the decrees of councils, churches, or synods. This principle would effectually put an end to all impositions, and unless it be allowed, I am afraid our separation from the Church of Rome can hardly be justified." It may, however, be argued, and upon grounds not easily overthrown, that we did not separate from the Church of Rome, but she from us. The latitude which Neal mentions, and which the Puritans undoubtedly claimed for themselves, they showed no disposition to allow in others. Nor practically does it extend much beyond the leaders of any party. The majority of Protestant nonconformists, as of other people, leans upon authority. Again: it is very doubtful whether Puritan demands were consistent with "the peace and safety of the government."

[1] NEAL. ii. 22. He "entered into St. John's college, Cambridge, 1550, where he became a hard student, never sleeping above five hours in a night. During the reign of Queen Mary, he left the university, and became a lawyer's clerk; but upon the accession of Elizabeth, he resumed his theological studies, and was chosen fellow of Trinity college in the year 1563. The year following he bore a part in the philosophy act before the Queen. In the year 1567, he commenced bachelor of divinity, and three years after was chosen Lady Margaret's professor. He was such a popular preacher, that when his turn came at St. Mary's, the sexton was obliged to take down the windows. But Mr. Cartwright venturing in some of his lectures to shew the defects of the discipline of the Church, as it then stood, was questioned for it before the Vice-Chancellor, denied his doctor's degree, and expelled the university."—*Ib.*

verely studious, and his reputation brought him forward as one of the two opponents in the philosophy act, when Elizabeth visited the University in 1564. The other opponent was Preston, a fellow of King's, who also bore a principal part in the tragedy of *Dido*, acted for the royal amusement. His person and delivery were so prepossessing, that the queen rewarded him both by a verbal compliment, and an annual pension of twenty pounds. Cartwright, obtaining less cordial praise, and no gratuity, was bitterly disappointed. He seems to have challenged admiration for learning and ability, however unadorned. The mortifying discovery of miscalculation, many thought, first made him an enemy to established authority[1]. His

---

[1] "The first discontent of the said Master Cartwright grew at a disputation in the University before Queen Elizabeth, because Master Preston (then of King's college, and afterward Master of Trinity hall) for his comely gesture, and pleasing pronunciation, was both liked and rewarded by her Majesty, and himself received neither reward nor commendation, presuming of his own good scholarship, but wanting indeed that comely grace and behaviour which the other had. This his no small grief he uttered unto divers of his inward friends in Trinity college, who were also very much discontented, because the honour of the disputation did not redound unto their college. Mr. Cartwright, immediately after her Majesty's neglect of him, began to wade into divers opinions, as that of the *Discipline*, and to kick against her ecclesiastical government; he also grew highly conceited of himself for learning and holiness, and a great contemner of others, who were not of his mind. And although the learning and qualities of any were never so mean, yet if he affected Master Cartwright and his opinions, he should be in great estimation with him, according to the saying of the poet:

Præcipui sunto, sitque illis aurea barba.

But if he were against him in his fanciful conceits, though he were never so good a scholar, or so good a man, he could not brook or like of him, as of Dr. Whitaker, and others: and although in their elections of scholars into that college, they made as good choise as any other, either before, or in their time, yet could he never afford the electors, nor parties elected, a good word, unless they sided with him in his fancies. And that he might the better feed his humour with these conceited novelties, he travailed to Geneva; where observing the government and discipline of that church to be by certain ecclepartisans resented the imputation as calumnious, but knowledge of human nature will hardly deny its probability[1]. Soon after his unsatisfactory notice by the queen, he withdrew to Geneva, and became thoroughly imbued with all the principles prevailing there. He went abroad, hostile to cap and surplice, discontented with his country's

---

siastical superintendents, and lay-elders, or presbyters, (as they called them) he was so far carried away with an affection of that new devised discipline, as that he thought all churches and congregations ecclesiastical were to be measured and squared by the practice of Geneva."—(*The Life of Archbishop Whitgift*, by Sir George Paule, Comptroller of his Grace's Houshold. Lond. 1699. p. 11.)

"He was one that always stubbornly refused the cap, and the like ornaments, agreeable to the Queen's Injunctions: a bold man, and wrote Latin well, and had studied divinity so far as to have taken his degree of bachelor of divinity. But whether it were out of some disgust of not being hitherto preferred, or out of an admiration of the discipline practised in the church of Geneva, or both, he set himself, with some other young men in the university, to overthrow the government of this church, and propounded a quite different model to be set up in the room of it."—Strype. *Annals*. i. pt. 2. p. 373.

[1] "Cartwright had dealt most with the muses, Preston with the graces, adorning his learning with comely carriage, graceful gesture, and pleasing pronunciation. Cartwright disputed like a *great*, Preston like a *gentile* scholar, being a handsome man: and the Queen (upon parity of deserts) always preferred properness of person in conferring her favours. Hereupon with her looks, words, and deeds, she favoured Preston, calling him her scholar, as appears by his epitaph, in Trinity hall chapel, which thus beginneth,

Conderis hoc tumulo, Thoma Prestone, Scholarem
Quem dixit Princeps Elizabetha suum.

Insomuch, that for his good disputing, and excellent acting in the tragedy of *Dido*, she bestowed on him a pension of 20*li.* a year, whilst Mr. Cartwright, (saith my author) received neither reward nor commendation, whereof he not only complained to his inward friends in Trinity college, but also, after her Majesty's neglect of him, began to wade into divers opinions against her ecclesiastical government. But Mr. Cartwright's followers (who lay the foundation of his disaffection to the discipline established, in his conscience, not carnal discontentment) credit not the relation. Adding moreover, that the Queen did highly commend, though not reward him. But whatever was the cause, soon after he went beyond the seas, and after his travel returned a bitter enemy to the hierarchy."—Fuller. *Hist. Camb.* 139.

ecclesiastical polity, strict in religious profession, and confident in his own attainments. He returned, strenuously arguing against every ecclesiastical name and office, not expressly found in the New Testament, and insisting that all Scripture must bear the sense current at Geneva. From his energy and activity soon arose the *disciplinarian* school of Puritanism. Its doctrines, like other novelties, ably recommended, were naturally sure of extensive approbation among the younger academics, and Cartwright was elected Margaret professor of divinity[1]. His lectures reprobated archbishops, deans, archdeacons, and the like, as impious both in name and office, hence calling for abolition; he denied also episcopal rights of ordination, referring this and all other points of discipline to the Church at large[2]. He was himself only a deacon, but even this character he professedly renounced, having apparently destroyed his letters of orders. His power to preach was wholly rested upon a call to the ministry abroad[1]. Against the surplice he, and two followers, preached with so much vehemence, on one Sunday morning, that all Trinity College, excepting three, appeared without it in the chapel at evening prayers[2]. The master, Dr. John Whitgift, was opportunely absent. On his return, the irregularity was redressed, and measures were immediately taken for staying the ferment which daily became more embarrassing. Cartwright was denied a doctor's degree, ejected first from his fellowship, then from his professorship, forbidden to preach within the vice-chancellor's jurisdiction, and driven from the university[3]. The fellowship was forfeited, by his refusal to

---

[1] On Dr. William Chaderton's resignation, in May or June, 1570. STRYPE. *Annals.* i. pt. 2. p. 373.

[2] "He taught such doctrine (as the said Dr. Chaderton wrote to Cecil, their high chancellor) as was pernicious and intolerable in a Christian commonwealth: that is, that in the Church of England there was no lawful and ordinary calling and choosing or admitting of ministers: and that the election of ministers and bishops at this day was tyrannous. And that *archiepiscopi, decani, archidiaconi,* &c. were *officia et nomina impietatis:* i.e., archbishops, deans, archdeacons, &c. were offices and names of impiety."—(*Ib.*)

The charge of *impiety*, Cartwright seems to have been willing, on deliberation, to abandon. When deprived, he signed the following propositions, as those which his lectures had inculcated.

"I. Archiepiscoporum, et Archidiaconorum nomina, simul cum muneribus et officiis suis, sunt abolenda.

"II. Legitimorum in Ecclesia ministrorum nomina, qualia sunt Episcoporum et Diaconorum, separata a suis muneribus in verbo Dei descriptis, simpliciter sunt improbanda, et ad institutionem apostolicam revocanda. Ut Episcopus in verbo et precibus, Diaconus in pauperibus curandis versetur.

"III. Episcoporum Cancellariis, aut Archidiaconorum Officialibus, &c. regimen Ecclesiæ non est committendum; sed ad idoneum ministrum et presbyterum ejusdem ecclesiæ est deferendum.

"IV. Non oportet ministrum esse vagum et liberum; sed quisque debet certo cuidam gregi addici.

"V. Nemo debet ministerium, tanquam candidatus, petere.

"VI. Episcoporum tantum authoritate et potestate Ministri non sunt creandi, multo minus in Musæo, aut loco quopiam clanculario. Sed ab Ecclesia electio fieri debet.

"Hisce reformandis quisque pro sua vocatione studere debet. Vocationem autem intelligo, ut magistratus authoritate, minister verbo, omnes precibus, promoveant."—(Strype. *Whitgift.* Append. IX. iii. 20.) The preceding document, (VIII. p. 16.) a letter from Whitgift to Cecil, besides mentioning these propositions, names the letter of Scripture as the ground taken by Cartwright.

[1] "I have pronounced Mr. Cartwright to be no fellow here, because contrary both to the express words of his oath, and plain statute of this college, he hath continued here above his time, not being ful minister; which truly I did not know until now of late: for if I had known it before, I might have eased myself of much trouble, and the college of great contention." (Dr. Whitgift to Archbishop Parker. Strype. *Whitgift.* i. 96.) "Having no letters of orders, which he had either torn or suppressed, for that he thought it not lawful by his own doctrine to use them." (Paule's *Whitgift.* 15.) The ordination which Cartwright acknowledged as valid appears to have been at Antwerp.—Strype. *Annals.* iii. 179.

[2] Paule's *Whitgift.* 12.

[3] He was deprived of his fellowship in October, 1570, and of his professorship on the eleventh of December following. He had intended to take a doctor's degree at the preceding commencement, but Archbishop Grindal, mild as he was, and favourable to the Puritans, advised the denial of this honour. A strong party would

take priest's orders, as he was bound by oath. Upon this, he was rather invidiously stigmatised by Whitgift, as "flatly perjured[1]." He scarcely merited such a charge, but other severities were unexceptionable. Cambridge could not continue facilities for undermining the national institutions, nor were her honours fairly claimable by one who tasked a powerful and active mind to force a new religious polity upon the country. As usual, however, there were loud complaints of envy, calumny, persecution, and power bent upon overwhelming truth[2]. Cartwright

---

have gratified Cartwright, but Dr. Mey, then vice-chancellor, refused the grace. "Which so displeased both him and all his adherents, that from this time, the degrees of doctors, bachelors, and masters, were esteemed unlawful, and those that took them reckoned limbs of Antichrist, as appears by the Genevian notes on the *Revelation*." (HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 264.) Cecil, the chancellor, states Cartwright's offence to be "taxing such ministers, as, namely, and such like he findeth not expressly named in the books of the New Testament." He inhibited Cartwright from farther mooting the contested points until the next term, when he wished "that some order may be taken therein." Cartwright assented, but the vice-chancellor and the heads inhibited him from lecturing altogether. They then subtracted his stipend, on his repeated refusals to revoke, and finding him inaccessible to any of their reasons, removed him at the end of the year.—STRYPE. *Annals.* i. pt. 2. p. 378. *Whitgift.* Append. IX. iii. 19.

[1] Dr. Whitgift to Archbishop Parker, *ut supra.*

[2] "Hereupon Cartwright and his followers began to mouth it, complaining that the man had been mightily wronged, in being deprived of his preferments in the university, without being called unto his answer; that Cartwright had made many offers of disputation for trial of the points in question, but could never be heard; and therefore, that Whitgift supplied this by excess of power, which he was not able to make good, by defect of arguments." (HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 264.) To stop this language, Whitgift, now vice-chancellor, caused an attested entry to be placed among the university records, stating that "Master Cartwright was offered conference of divers, and namely of M. Doctor Whitgift, who offered, that, if the said Master Cartwright would set down his assertions in writing, and his reasons unto them, he would answer the same in writing also: the which Master Cartwright refused to do. Further, the said Doctor Whitgift, at such time as Master Cartwright was deprived of his lecture, did, in our presence, ask

retired again to the Continent, sore from recent proceedings, and eager to fortify himself for another struggle as leader of the party demanding a *holy discipline*. He left Cambridge violently agitated, even the pulpit being abused, by some of its younger occupants, to the grossest personalities[1].

In the House of Commons his principles rapidly gained a commanding position. A new parliament met on the second of April, and its popular branch was found strongly impregnated with religious discontent. The lead was taken by an aged gentleman, named Strickland, whose fiery temper and energetic spirit had bidden defiance to the damping power of accumulated years. In its general tenor he admitted that the Book of Common Prayer made very near approaches to unquestionable truth, and he did not overlook Romish reproaches upon

---

the said Master Cartwright, whether he had both publicly and privately divers times offered the same conference to him by writing, or not. To which Master Cartwright answered that he had been so offered, and that he refused the same. Moreover, the said Master Cartwright did never offer any disputation, but upon these conditions; *viz.* that he might know who should be his adversaries, and who should be his judges; meaning such judges as he himself could best like of. Neither was this kind of disputation denied him, but only he was required to obtain licence of the Queen's Majesty, or the council, because his assertions be repugnant to the state of the commonwealth, which may not be called into question, without licence of the Prince, or her Highness's council."—PAULE'S *Whitgift*. 18. Three Latin letters to Cecil, exculpatory and supplicatory, one from Cartwright himself, the others from some of his adherents, are printed in the Appendix to STRYPE'S *Annals*. I. II. III. ii. pt. 2. 411, 12, 15.

[1] In a letter from the Doctors Whitgift, Perne, and Mey, to Archbishop Parker, complaint is made of "the licentiouse and contestiouse manner of preachinge used now adays at Cambridge by divers younge preachers, who are not afraide to ympunge openly in pulpett not only the booke of common service: but also particulerlie discribe and name men of all degrees both honorable that be absent and other that be present, according to the license of the olde poetes."—LAMB'S *Collection of Letters*, &c. Lond. 1838. p. 356.

Protestant mutability. But he charged the English offices with some superstitions and errors irreconcileable with genuine religion; and he argued that his objections involved no substantial change. He had prepared a bill to abrogate the sign of a cross in baptism, kneeling at the communion, and other usages obnoxious to the Puritans. In urging this case he likewise recommended, that a profession of faith should be prepared, after the example of foreign churches, and confirmed by parliament. This portion of his speech was not unreasonable, for the articles of religion could plead only synodical and royal authority. The queen's interference had hitherto deprived them of legislative sanction. Strickland also moved that Cranmer's book, now usually known as the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, be laid before the house, for its ratification. Many of the members were willing to co-operate in carrying his propositions. But Elizabeth felt as acutely upon questions of the supremacy as if she had been bred in the Vatican. She no sooner heard of these encroachments upon her claims to ecclesiastical privileges, than the bold mover was ordered to attend before the privy council, and to refrain from entering the House of Commons. Even those days were not sufficiently servile for such a breach of privilege, and a serious disposition to resentment was only suppressed by the opportune removal of the sequestered member's restraint[1]. On returning to his place he was immediately chosen on a committee. Court influence, however, was exerted successfully against most of his projected innovations.

To disregard the House altogether was neither becoming nor prudent, and it was gratified by a formal conference, at Lambeth, with the bishops. The committee attending there seems to have brought a draught for the desired profession of faith. A paper was presented, which embodied most of the Thirty-nine Articles, but omitted those which approved the homilies and the hierarchy. The archbishop demanded an explanation of this. He was answered with some warmth by a member named Peter Wentworth, "It is because our urgent calls to other business have not allowed us time to examine how far these articles agree with God's word." Parker said, "Surely, ye will refer yourselves therein wholly to us." Wentworth rejoined, "Nay, by the faith I bear to God, we will pass nothing before we understand what it is. For that were to make you popes. Make you popes who list: we will make you none[1]."

---

[1] STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. 96. D'EWES'S *Journals of Parliaments, during the Reign of Queen Eliz.* Lond. 1682. p. 176.

To allay these heats, Elizabeth relaxed some of her pretensions to supremacy, and a sort of compromise was adopted. *An Act* passed *For Ministers of the Church to be of Sound Religion*, enjoined subscription before the bishop, by all clergymen then beneficed but questionably ordained, to such of the articles of 1562 as ONLY *concern the profession of the true Christian faith, and the doctrine of the sacraments.* Thus the articles received, at length, statutable authority, and ordinations, conducted neither by King Edward's Ordinal, nor by that now in force, were formally recognised. This appears to have been chiefly meant for the case of incumbents in Romish orders[2], which some Protestant zealots denounced as anti-christian and invalid. But it might apply, in favourable hands, to the foreign ordinations, without episcopal intervention, from which some ecclesiastics, of puritanical principles, drew their ministerial character. Hence it could hardly fail of proving a concession to the low-church party. Nor was the limitation of enforced subscription to the doctrinal articles, otherwise than a half compliance with their demand for an authenticated confession of faith[1]. All these appear to have been admitted by the Commons. It was only discipline which occasioned clamour out of doors, and which the members professed themselves unable hitherto to test by a sufficient examination.

---

[1] STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. 240. Mr. Wentworth was member for Tregony.

[2] The act concerned all under the degree of a bishop, and was meant "undoubtedly to comprehend Papists, and likewise such as received their orders in some of the foreign reformed churches, when they were in exile under Queen Mary." (STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. 105.) Travers admits the provision to have arisen from Romish ordinations. "*Anno* 13 *Eliz.* When question was made of their" (the Romishly-ordained

In the latter years of Elizabeth's reign this was found to be an insidious statute. Under its protection many avowed enemies to the established discipline claimed a right of entering the church, or of retaining benefices. These claims were, however, disallowed. For this, Dissenters tax the legality of episcopal severities, maintaining that the clergy were under no legislative compulsion, either to use episcopacy for ordination, or to admit its consonance with sound principles[2]. The act, however,

---

clergymen's) "calling, the Parliament appointed not that they should be ordered again, according to the form established in the first year of her Majestie's reign; but only that they should subscribe to the Articles concerning Christian doctrine and faith, agreed on in the Convocation, *anno* 1562."—Mr. Travers's Reasons. *Whitgift*. Append. xxx. iii. 185.

[1] "This clause seems to be inserted to meet with those of the House that moved for a new confession of faith to be made: which needed not, since those articles of religion was the Church of England's sufficient confession of the true Christian faith."—*Ib.* marg. note.

[2] "It appears from the words of this statute, that those articles of the Church which relate to its discipline, were not designed to be the terms of ministerial conformity; and if the Queen and the bishops had governed themselves accordingly, the separation had been stifled in its infancy; for there was hardly a Puritan in Eng-

was framed, in some particulars, rather to meet temporary difficulties, than to regulate ecclesiastical affairs permanently. The beneficed men, to whom this qualified subscription was to be tendered, had, indeed, already recognised episcopal authority by receiving institution under it. The race of clergymen ordained in papal times was wearing out. Domestic persecution might never again drive English Protestants to seek ordination from foreign churches. None were to be ordained, in future, without subscription, and institution without regular ordination, was hereafter unlikely. Hence, there was reason to reckon, at no distant period, upon the disappearance of those anomalies which had hitherto necessitated some disregard of established principles. Legal authorities have accordingly decided, that this act gives statutable vigour to *all* the articles, and renders an unreserved subscription demandable from clergymen[1].

land that refused subscription to the doctrinal articles. If all the Thirty-nine Articles had been established, there had been no need of the following clause, *which* ONLY *concern the confession of the true Christian faith, and the doctrine of the sacraments.* And yet notwithstanding this act, many that held benefices and ecclesiastical preferments, and that offered to conform to the statute, were deprived in the following part of this reign: which was owing to the bishops' servile compliance with the prerogative, and pressing subscription to more than the law required."—NEAL. i. 237.

[1] "By this restriction in the word ONLY, all articles relating to the Homilies, the Ordinal, the Churches power in imposing rites and ceremonies, and her authority in controversies of faith, seem omitted on purpose, as if it had not been the design of the statute to bring those articles within the subscription. However, the following branches require subscription to the articles without any exception. And that this was the meaning of the Legislature, is farther made good by Sir Edward Coke's authority, who positively affirms, that the subscription required by the clergy takes in all the nine-and-thirty articles. And that by this statute, the delinquent is disabled and deprived *ipso facto.* He adds farther, that when one Smith subscribed the nine-and-thirty articles with this addition, *so far forth as the same were agreeable to the word of God,* 'twas

As a preparatory step to a call upon the clergy for subscription, either qualified or general, the convocation ordered a new impression of the Articles to be struck off under Bishop Jewel's direction[1]. That eminent prelate, then near his end, might seem to have omitted the affirmative clause in the 20th Article, which Burton branded, in Archbishop Laud's time, as a prelatical forgery[2]. This

---

resolv'd by Sir Christopher Wray, Chief Justice in the King's Bench, and all the judges of England, that this subscription was not according to the statute of 13 *Eliz. cap.* 12. Because the statute requir'd an absolute subscription, whereas this subscription made it conditional. And farther, this Act was made for avoiding Diversity of Opinions, *&c.* But by this qualification or addition, the party might by his own private opinion, take some of the articles to be against the word of God: and so by this means, diversity of opinions would not be avoided: and thus the scope of the statute, and the very act itself made touching subscription, would be of none effect. Thus far Sir Edward Coke.

However, the Puritans took their advantage of the ambiguity of the first part of the statute, and made this their defence against their subscribing the whole number of the articles." (COLLIER. ii. 531.)

Contemporaries ordinarily do not appear to have put that interpretation upon this statute which agrees with the views of ancient Puritans and modern Dissenters. This parliament passed an act to restrain dignitaries from granting leases for more than twenty-one years, or three lives. Referring to this, Cambden says, "On the other side also was restrain'd by wholesome laws, as well the covetousness of certain churchmen, who (as if born for themselves alone) did, to the notorious defrauding of their successors, waste the church-revenues, and let out leases for many years: as also the insolence of others, who, desirous of innovation, oppos'd the Articles concluded-upon in a synod at London, in the year 1562, for abolishing of schisms." (*Eliz.* 436.)

Nevertheless, it is plain that this clause was framed with a view to allow some latitude as to subscription, as well as to get rid of the application for a new confession. Existing difficulties demanded a temporary indulgence, which the act generally would not warrant hereafter. That a continuance of such indulgence would have "stifled the separation," as Neal appears to have thought, is rendered improbable by subsequent events, and by that knowledge of human nature which those events convey.

[1] STRYPE. *Parker.* ii. 53.

[2] *The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith.* This clause "*is not found* in the Latin edition of Day, published under the direction of Bishop

omission does not, however, universally occur in the

Jewel, in 1571 :—In the English edition of Jugg and Cawood, published under the direction of Bishop Jewel, in 1571." (LAMB'S *Historical Account of the Thirty-nine Articles.* Camb. 1829. p. 37.) These editions Dr. Lamb professes to reprint, but Bishop Jewel's name appears in neither of them. That learned and amiable prelate was commissioned to undertake the work, at Lambeth, May 4. He died Sept. 23.

This omission gave an opportunity to Burton (deemed a martyr under the Long Parliament) to indulge in the following language :—" The prelates, to justify their proceedings, have forged a new Article of Religion, brought from Rome, (which gives them full power over the doctrine and discipline of our Church at a blow,) and have foisted it into the 20th Article of our Church. And this is in the last edition of the Articles, *anno* 1628, in affront of his Majesty's declaration before them. The clause forged is this: *The Church* (that is, the bishops, as they expound it,) *hath power*, &c. This clause is a forgery fit to be examined and deeply censured in the Star Chamber. For it is not to be found in the Latin or English Articles of Edward VI. or Queen Elizabeth, ratified by parliament. And if to forge a will or writing be censurable in the Star Chamber, which is but a wrong to a private man, how much more the forgery of an Article of Religion, to wrong the whole Church, and overturn religion which concerns all our souls." —FULLER. *Ch. Hist.* 73.

If Jewel really lived long enough to see his revised editions of the Articles printed, the 20th, as it appeared, may be taken as evidence of a mind over-sensitive. Perhaps there might be something of this in his nature. His Oxford recantation, under Mary, proves him not to have been cast in the sternest mould. His retraction of this weak compliance, on arriving at Frankfort, exhibited him in the pulpit weeping and sobbing under shame and agony. Literary conflict seems, indeed, that alone for which he was formed. To boisterous, or dangerous personal contact with oppressors and opponents, his gentle nature was hardly equal. Mere physical weakness will partly account for this. He was a spare, sickly man through life, and his infirmities were aggravated by an unshrinking, conscientious industry. He was among the most vigilant of diocesans, the most laborious of students, and the most frequent of preachers. Fully alive to the urgent call for his exertions, he could not be kept out of the pulpit, when visibly sinking into the grave. On a laborious visitation, to which he was quite unequal, he had engaged to preach at Lacock, in Wiltshire. He was besought to consider his manifest unfitness for the task. But he answered, that death in the pulpit would become a bishop. It was but barely that he escaped this fate. Having struggled through his promised sermon, he rode to Monkton Farley, where he laid his wasted frame upon the bed of death. He was then under fifty, impressions of 1571[1]. Leicester, and some other courtiers, favourable to the Puritan party, are supposed to have occasioned its occurrence in any, both now and heretofore[2]. To the influence of these powerful individuals, recent concessions have been reasonably attributed, and it is hardly doubtful that the surreptitious curtailment, which became so famous, must at least have had their approval[3]. The bishops, probably, found it neces-

---

and his last days edified all around by that ardent, humble piety, which shed a holy lustre over his whole life. His works are numerous, and among them is an answer to the incendiary bull, by which Pius pretended to deprive Elizabeth. To Romanists, his memory was naturally odious, and they have taken pains to blacken it. Nor did Puritanism leave it unassailed. But Jewel's industry, learning, zeal, eloquence, gentle temper, unblemished morals, place him altogether above the darts of angry controversialists.

[1] "There are three different editions of the book of the Thirty-nine Articles in English, printed in this year, 1571, by Jugg and Cawood, all which have this clause (and perhaps there were more). Which three editions, with the said clause, I myself saw, as well as other inquisitive persons, at Mr. Wilkins's, a bookseller in St. Paul's Churchyard." (STRYPE. *Parker*. ii. 54.) "Bennet, in his account of the Thirty-nine Articles, states, that there are four editions of the Articles in English, printed by Jugg and Cawood, in 1571, containing the disputed clause. Three of these editions, which he calls C, D, and E, agree, excepting their title-pages, in every line, word, letter, and stop." (LAMB. *ut supra*. note.) This leaves the testimony of Strype unimpaired.

[2] The clause "*is not found* in the English editions of Jugg and Cawood of 1563. *It is found* in the Latin edition of Wolfe of 1563."—LAMB. *ut supra*.

[3] "What? Is this affirmative in no copy, English or Latin, till the year 1628? Strange! Why, I have a copy of the Articles in English of the year 1612, and of the year 1605, and of the year 1593, and of the Latin of the year 1563, which was one of the first printed copies, if not the first of all. For the articles were agreed on but the 29th day of January, 1563. And in all these, this affirmative clause for the Church's power is in." (ARCHBISHOP LAUD'S *Speech*, in the Star Chamber, *at the censure of Bastwick, Burton, and Prinn*, June 14, 1637, p. 83, at the end of his own *History of his Troubles and Tryal*. Lond. 1695.) The archbishop proceeds to say, that the case demanding certainty, "I sent to the public records in my office, and here, under my officer's hand, who is a public notary, is returned to me

sary to connive at the circulation of this truncated document, not even refusing subscriptions to it. They were

the 20th Article, with this affirmative clause in it. And there is also the whole body of the Articles to be seen. By this your lordships see how free the prelates are from forging this part of the Article. Now let these men quit themselves and their faction as they can, for their *Index Expurgatorius*, and their foul rasure, in leaving out this part of the Article. For to leave out of an Article is as great a crime as to put in, and a main rasure is as censurable in this court as a forgery. Why, but then, my lords, what is this *mystery of iniquity?* Truly, I cannot certainly tell, but as far as I can, I'll tell you. The Articles you see were fully and fairly agreed to and subscribed in the year 1563. But after this, in the year 1571, there were some that refused to subscribe: but why they did so, is not recorded. Whether it were about this Article, or any other, I know not. But, in fact, this is manifest, that, in the year 1571, the Articles were printed both in Latin and English, and this clause for the Church left out of both. And certainly this could not be done, but by the malicious cunning of that opposite faction. And though I shall spare dead men's names where I have not certainty, yet if you be pleased to look back, and consider who they were that governed businesses in 1571, and rid the Church almost at their pleasure, and how potent the ancestors of these libellers began then to grow, you will think it no hard matter to have the Articles printed, and this clause left out. And yet 'tis plain, that after the stir about subscription in 1571, the Articles were settled and subscribed unto at last, as in the year 1562, with this clause in them for the Church: for looking farther into the records, which are in mine own hands, I have found the book of 1563, subscribed by all the Lower House of Convocation, in this very year of contradiction, 1571, Dr. John Elmar (who was after lord bishop of London) being there Prolocutor: Alexander Nowel, dean of St. Paul's, having been Prolocutor in 1563, and yet living, and present, and subscribing in 1571. Therefore, I do here openly in the Star Chamber, charge upon that *pure sect* this *foul corruption* of falsifying the Articles of the Church of England: let them take it off as they can."

This appeal, made with a certified copy in hand, and when the original was accessible, seems decisive of the question. Fuller, however, thus concludes an examination of this matter. "Whether the bishops were faulty in their *addition*, or their opposites in their *subtraction*, I leave to more cunning state-arithmeticians to decide." (*Ch. Hist.* 74.) This passage gives Neal occasion to write: "Heylin says, that he consulted the records of Convocation, and that the contested clause was in the book, and yet Fuller, a much fairer writer, who had the liberty of perusing the same records, declares he could never able to cope successfully with one, powerful both from royal partiality and Puritan gratitude. For a long space of time, any such liberties with important, public documents, have been impossible. Newspapers, periodicals, and numerous books of all sorts, form a bulwark which no degree of power or artifice can overleap. But Elizabeth's reign was very differently circumstanced, and actually displayed a more signal mutilation of the Articles than that which eventually misled Puritanical virulence so egregiously. The whole 29th Article is omitted in the impression of 1563; the identical *Book*, seemingly, which received parliamentary confirmation in 1571[1]. That Article, which is a stronger denial of transubstan-

---

not decide the controversy." (*Hist. Pur.* i. 160.) Fuller published in 1655, when admirers of Burton were in power. His evasion, therefore, which really will hardly bear Neal's construction, was obviously dictated by the time.

The records to which Laud and Heylin appealed, perished in the fire of London; but among the Parker MSS., in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, are two signed copies of the Articles, of which *fac-similes* are now printed by Dr. Lamb, both which want the disputed clause. Neal insists upon this as decisive against the clause. Strype, Collier, and others, have contended that the Benet MSS. are nothing more than carefully-prepared draughts. The erasures, and other circumstances, fully detailed by Collier (*Eccl. Hist.* ii. 487), leave hardly any room for doubting this.

Heylin says, of this omission, "So it stood with us in England, till the death of Leicester. After which, in the year 1593, the Articles were reprinted, and that clause resumed, according as it stands in the Publick Registers." —*Hist. Presb.* 268.

[1] The *Act for Ministers of the Church to be of sound Religion*, enjoins subscription to the Articles, "comprised in a book imprinted, intituled, *Articles whereupon*, &c. In the Parliament of 1566, which would have passed the Articles, had not Elizabeth, jealous of her supremacy, prevented it, they were described as a *Little Book* printed in 1562, for the sound Christian religion." Dr. Lamb says, that there are only three editions of the Articles before 1571; one in Latin, and two, precisely alike, in English. He considers that the *Act for Ministers*, &c., must refer to an English book, because the title given is English. (*Hist. Acc.* 26.) He has reprinted this *Little Book*,

tiation than the preceding one, and cites for that purpose a passage from St. Austin, now known to be weakened by interpolation, was, probably, considered both by the queen and Cecil, needlessly offensive to the Romanists[1]. If they were the parties who procured its omission in the printed copies, Leicester, and other powerful friends of the Puritans, might fairly plead for conciliating *them*, too, by merely curtailing the 20th Article to meet their prejudices. Undoubtedly, the church party complained of disingenuous management, and Archbishop Parker's confidential communications to Cecil were interspersed with charges of *Machiavellian policy*[2]. Practically, these ancient variations in copies of the Articles have lost all importance. The 36th Canon, confirmed by the *Act of Uniformity* under Charles II., renders the whole body of Articles, passed in the convocation, usually dated 1562, legally binding upon the clergy.

---

[1] This Article, *Of the wicked which eat not the body of Christ*, &c., appears in both the Benet MSS., but not the *Little Book*, if this be Jugg and Cawood's impression of 1563. Here, accordingly, are only Thirty-eight Articles. The 29th Article "was omitted, both in the Latin and English printed copies before 1571, in compliance with the wish or order of Cecil, probably at the suggestion of his royal mistress." (LAMB. 34.) The Article appears to have been Parker's own. He might have made it stronger, had he not been misled by the printed editions of Austin.—See the Author's *Bampton Lectures for* 1830. p. 404.

[2] While Clerk was employed in replying to Sanders, *De Visibili Monarchia*, he sent portions of his work, as they were completed, to Parker, which the archbishop transmitted to Cecil. "In one or two places, the author had given a stroke of his pen against the secret favour and connivance that some enjoyed who opposed the ecclesiastical rites and customs established in the Church; which the archbishop used to term *Machiavel-governance*, or by such like terms. Upon these passages in the book, the archbishop thought convenient to make his remark. Because he thought the lord treasurer would reckon that the author had the archbishop's information and direction herein. But the archbishop assured him *before God* (that was his word), that that tract was only of himself: nor that he did approve thereof. That, indeed, in private and secret letters to his lordship, he did sometime write of such manner of *Machiavel-governance*, as hearing sometimes wise men talk. But he liked not this particular charge, or application, in so open a writing, nor by his advice should it be inserted."—STRYPE. *Parker*. ii. 179.

The convocation endeavoured to stay the progress of Puritanism, by attacking its chief organ, the pulpit. A body of canons was passed, voiding all preaching licenses, granted before the last day of April then next ensuing[1]. Thus, every preacher was brought at once under the diocesan's revision, and none, whose doctrine was disapproved, or who shrank from promising future conformity, could expect a renewal of his license. These canons embraced also many particulars demanding regulation, and were unquestionably calculated to remedy much that was wanting in this branch of national jurisprudence. They were, however, denied the royal assent. Hence Archbishop Grindal, who was always glad of an excuse to screen the Puritans, justly doubted whether they had the *force of law*, and hinted dangers of a *præmunire*[2].

The Puritans naturally looked with contempt upon synodical regulations, which the court would not sanction. April expired, but May exhibited them neither suitors for new preaching licenses, nor forsaking the pulpit. Some preached, as usual, in their own churches, others in private houses. Some used the Geneva Liturgy, others made selections from the Book of Common Prayer[3]. Elizabeth was much displeased with this boldness and irregularity. Whatever might withhold her from authorising the canons themselves, she lost no time in letting the world see that she could endure no disobedience to them. Early in June, a royal mandate enjoined the High Commission Court to prevent all reading, praying, preaching, or administering the sacraments, in any place, public or private, without license from herself, the metropolitan, or the diocesan[1]. Soon afterwards the commissioners called Goodman, Lever, Sampson, and other leading Puritans, before them, at Lambeth. No severities are known to have ensued; but Lever, before the year closed, resigned a prebend, as it seems, of Durham. He found himself, probably, unable to retain it without some compromise of principle[2].

---

[1] *Liber quorundam Canonum. Anno* 1571.—Bishop Sparrow's *Collection.* p. 238.

[2] Extract of a letter from Archbishop Grindal to Archbishop Parker.—Strype. *Parker.* ii. 60.

[3] *Ib.* 65.

As public authority had proved hitherto unattainable for the religious discipline which so many desired, individuals became inclined to wait for it no longer. This impatience was first conspicuously displayed at Northampton. The mayor, with other leading persons of that town, and some neighbouring justices of the peace, undertook to abolish singing and organ-music in the choir, ordering prayers to be read, in the nave, and a psalm to be sung before and after sermon. The principal church, besides, was to have, on Tuesdays and Thursdays, a lecture from Scripture, prefaced with the general confession from the Book of Common Prayer, and followed by prayer and a confession of faith. Other orders prescribed sermons, a strict observance of Sunday, the public examination of youth in Calvin's catechism, inquiries by the ministers and churchwardens into the lives of intended communicants, and into the reasons of those who declined receiving, the correction of immorality and irreligion, with various particulars relating to public worship[1]. The whole religious and moral conduct of the town was thus to be brought under the control of a committee partly clerical and partly lay. Such a body might, undoubtedly, be useful in repressing immorality, but its views were likely to be narrow, and its proceedings arbitrary. To persons averse from Puritanism, or irregular in habits, it must have appeared as a self-constituted High Commission Court, constantly sitting at their own doors; only far more inquisitorial than the queen's court of that name, which sat occasionally at Lambeth.

---

[1] *The Commissioners Ecclesiastical to all Churchwardens.* June 7, 13th of the Queen.—Strype. *Parker.* Append. LXII. iii. 183.

[2] *Ib.* ii. 66.

Another feature in these Northampton regulations, rapidly gained popularity in many parts of England. St. Paul's mention of *prophesying one by one*[2], gave a hint for the arrangement of religious meetings, in which Scripture might be expounded and debated. Edmund Scambler, the bishop of Peterborough, thought his clergy likely to have their information extended, and their faculties improved by this plan. Some other prelates were equally favourable, and *prophesyings* were established with approbation, in various directions. Due provision was made for the orderly conduct of these *exercises*, as the phrase ran, and they could not fail of helping to develop the national intellect. They were also likely to weaken the force of Romish prejudice, a particular declaration against papal corruptions being required of all who took a part in them[3]. But Puritanical opinions gave rise to them, and were extended by their means. Mere devotion and instruction were not likely long, either to extract superfluous labours from a body of clergymen, or to secure the attention of lay auditors. Such ends, however, would be easily answered by means of claims to exclusive spiritual privileges, and stirring reflections upon existing institutions. To such topics, therefore, the younger, more indiscreet, and more aspiring speakers, would infallibly resort. The *prophesyings*, accordingly, were soon found to be nurseries of party spirit. Anxiety to awaken and cultivate the minds of their clergy, made some of the bishops very unwilling to discern this evil quality. But Elizabeth looked on with jealousy from the first. Her eagle eye detected a lurking mischief in this popular *exercise*, which recluse piety was unable to distinguish. Hence we shall soon find her insisting upon its total suppression.

---

[1] Strype. *Annals*. ii. 135.

[2] 1 Cor. xiv. 31.

[3] Strype. *Annals*. ii. 139.

She felt, however, the necessity of paying some attention to the prevailing clamour for discipline. Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper, who delivered the opening speech to her fourth parliament, reflected upon laymen of distinction for slighting the ecclesiastics, and setting a bad example. Of the clergy he spoke as insufficient in number, and often incompetent; also as occasionally arrogant, and prone to innovate, or vary in doctrine. Rites and ceremonies, he says, were ill-observed, and fallen into disesteem, which caused a general neglect of public worship among the common people. His remedies are a more careful selection of rural deans, and an immediate conference among the bishops to ascertain whether an increase of episcopal efficiency would require new powers from parliament[1]. Any such were most unlikely to be granted by the House of Commons. It was leavened by those envious polemics, whose violence claims an unbounded vent whenever wealth and station light upon a clergyman. Hence Parker, writing to Burghley, supposes him hardly aware of the manner in which the bishops were "bearded[1]." In utter neglect of them, accordingly, two bills were brought into the Lower House, for abolishing the bulk of established rites and ceremonies, and rejecting some of the Thirty-nine Articles[2]. The Commons passed that for rites and ceremonies, and it was referred to a committee of the two Houses. But Elizabeth signified her high displeasure, and both bills were dropped[3]. Her desire to have ecclesiastical measures originate with the prelacy, fell upon most unwilling ears. Peter Wentworth, member for Tregony, leader of the popular and Puritanical party, afterwards said, that "God would not vouchsafe to let his Spirit descend upon the bishops, all that session of parliament: so that nothing was done to the advancement of His glory[4]."

---

[1] D'Ewes. 193.

---

[1] STRYPE. *Parker*. ii. 201.

[2] *Ib.* 202.

[3] The bill for rites and ceremonies was read the third time, and referred to a committee in the Star Chamber, May 20. Two days after, "Upon declaration made unto this House by Mr. Speaker, from the Queen's Majesty, that her Highness's pleasure is, that from henceforth no bills shall be preferred, or received into this House, unless the same should be first considered and liked by the clergy. And further, that her Majesties pleasure is to see the two last bills read in this House touching Rites and Ceremonies," (D'EWES. 213) "Mr. Treasurer reported to the House" (May 23) "the delivery of the two bills of Rites and Ceremonies to her Majesty, together with the humble request of this House, most humbly to beseech her Highness not to conceive ill opinion of this House, if it so were that her Majesty should not like well of the said bills, or of the parties that preferred them. And declared further, that her Majesty seemed utterly to mislike of the first bill, and of him that brought the same into the House."—*Ib.* 214.

[4] Speech of Mr. Wentworth, on the re-assembling of this Parliament, after prorogation, in 1575. (*Ib.* 239.) The speaker making free with Elizabeth, as well as with the bishops, "was for unreverent and undutiful words uttered by him, in this House, of our sovereign Lady, the Queen's Majesty, sequestered." (*Ib.* 236.)

These words really meant no more, than that Parliament separated without a single step towards the *discipline* upon which many popular spirits insisted so loudly. Probably the Puritans had reckoned upon a different issue. Before the legislature met, a party of their ministers concocted privately in London an address to both Houses, containing a full development of their views and wishes[1]. Whether the intention was to offer this important document to Parliament, or only to circulate it as an authentic declaration of Puritanical sentiments, cannot now be ascertained. But it never came before the members in their corporate capacity. The world knew nothing of it until the prorogation[2]. It then appeared in the shape of a pamphlet, or perhaps more properly, of two pamphlets, entitled, *An Admonition to the Parliament*, first and second. The very title was thought by some to savour of presumption: petition seeming to become the framers rather than admonition[3]. The whole piece, however, breathes a spirit of intolerant, sarcastic, and haughty

---

This speech not only relates particulars of the session of 1572, but also of the parliament of 1571.

[1] "Certain persons assembled themselves privately together in London, as I have been informed, namely, Gilbye, Sampson, Lever, Field, Wilcox, and I wot not who besides. And then it was agreed upon, as it seemeth, that an Admonition (which the now Lord Archbishop of Canterbury did afterwards confute,) should be compiled and offered unto the Parliament approaching, *Anno* 1572."—ABP. BANCROFT'S *Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline*. Lond. 1663, p. 2.

[2] "They did not only propounde it out of time (after the Parliament was ended) but out of order also, that is, in the manner of a libell."—ABP. WHITGIFT'S *Defense*, 13.

[3] "And now Thomas Cartwright, chief of the Nonconformists, presents the Parliament with a book, called an *Admonition*, some members taking distaste at the title thereof. For seeing *Admonition* is the lowest of ecclesiasticall censures, and a preparative, (if neglected,) to suspension, and excommunication, such suggested, that if the Parliament complied not with this *Admonitor's* desires, his party (whereof he the speaker) would proceed to higher and lowder fulminations."—FULLER. 102.

defiance which ill become religious advocates. It is, indeed, often such as serious men hardly could pen, unless galled by unwonted pecuniary pressure. Irritation from this cause may unquestionably be pleaded for the *Admonition.* Its authors, mentioning themselves as *poor men,* bitterly play upon the words, by adding, *whom they,* the ecclesiastical authorities namely, *have made poor*[1]. They seek to fortify their opinion by the authority of Beza, to whom they had evidently applied at the outset of their undertaking. He sent a letter to some great man in England, most probably Leicester, in contemplation of a parliament, shortly to be holden, and expected to enter upon religious questions. This epistle was published with the *Admonition,* as was one of Gualter's to Bishop Parkhurst. Beza's communication maintains that *pure doctrine* is of little use without *pure discipline*[2]; in plain language, that England must be studded with petty democratic oligarchies, half clerical, half lay, like Geneva.

---

[1] "And therefore, though they linke in together, and sclaunderously charge poore men (whome they have made poore) with grievous faultes, calling them Puritans, worse than the Donatistes, exasperating, and setting-on such as be in authoritie, agaynst them, having hitherto miserably handled them with revilings, deprivations, imprisonments, banishments, and suche like extremities, yet is these poore men's cause never the worse, nor these challengers the better." —*Preface to the Admonition.* WHITGIFT. 57.

[2] "*Understanding, saith he, of an assembly of Estate in England, wherein there would be dealing with matters of religions, I could not choose but write to you of that matter.* And so he proceedeth, shewing *that all men doe allow of our Doctrine, but not of our Discipline.* That, *except where there is pure doctrine, there be also pure discipline,* meaning his own Genevian darling, *the Churches are little the better,* and therefore, *her Majesty and her faithfull councellors should procure the setting-up of this pure discipline,* notwithstanding any *difficulties* whatsoever that might hinder it." (*Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline,* 43.) Bancroft merely says, "It was also provided, that Beza should write his letter to a great man in this land, for, and in behalf of the chief contents thereof, viz. for the admitting in England of the said *Allobrogicall Discipline.*" (42.) A contemporary could hardly write more freely, especially, if the party meant were the queen's great favourite. Strype, free from such reserve, says, "Beza's letter to a great man in Eng-

It is this, upon which the *Admonition* insists; not upon the right of all men to worship God in their own way, which later times would expect to see claimed in such a piece. The monitors had no thought of showing the least indulgence to any but themselves. Their abhorrence of Popery was boundless, and of the national hierarchy equally so. They warn "the lordly lords, archbishops, bishops, suffragans, deans, doctors, archdeacons, chancellors, and the rest of that proud generation," that their "kingdom must down, hold they never so hard, because their tyrannous lordship cannot stand with Christ's kingdom." The nation, it is asserted, had neither "a right ministry," nor "a right government of the church according to Scripture," and hence could not long continue as it was, without being overtaken by God's judgments[1]. From the "true platform of a church reformed," now laid before it, Parliament might "learn with perfect hatred to detest," existing institutions, and to "endeavour that Christ might rule and reign by the sceptre of his word only[2]." The ministry required a trial both of "ability to instruct, and of godly conversation:" whereas it came from individual recommendations, procuring free reception for "tag and rag, learned and unlearned, the basest of the people[3]." Formerly ministers taught others, now they need instruction themselves, and "like young children, must learn catechisms[4]." The congregation formerly called a minister who had been

---

land, (perhaps, the Earl of Leicester) was writ about this time as a proper season."—*Whitgift.* i. 55.

[1] *Preface to the Admonition.* WHITGIFT'S *Defense.* 57.

[2] *Admonition. Ib.* 76.

[3] *Ib.* 132.

[4] *Ib.* 152.

elected by the whole church; now, episcopal authority alone thrusts one upon it who owes the benefice to money, favour, or unlawful importunity[1]. Exceptions are also taken to ordinations without a particular charge, and in any other way than by imposition of hands of the "eldership[2]." Anxiety to decry the national formularies then betrays the monitors into a groundless assertion, that clergymen were ordained with alb, surplice, vestment, and pastoral staff[3]. Use at ordinations of the words, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, is branded as "ridiculous and blasphemous[4]." Objections follow to non-residence, pluralities, the admission of clergymen qualified only to read, and the prohibition of preaching without episcopal license[5]. Cap, surplice, and tippet are disclaimed as principal objects of contention, though pronounced unsuitable for a minister, especially the surplice, "because such hurtful ceremonies are so much more dangerous, as they do approach nearer the service and worship of God[6]." Ministers, it is said, were anciently "known by voice, learning, and doctrine," now they are distinguished "by Popish and anti-christian apparel[7]," to which "as garments of the idol, of Balaamites, of Popish priests, enemies to God, and all Christians, we should say, *Avaunt*,

---

[1] *Admonition.* WHITGIFT'S *Defense*, 154, 155, 156, 196.

[2] *Ib.* 216, 225, 226.

[3] *Ib.* 226. It is difficult to account for this oversight. Whitgift, in his *Answer to the Admonition*, naturally takes a scornful tone here. He says, "In the booke now allowed of making deacons and ministers, and consecrating bishops, there is neyther required albe, surplesse, vestment, nor pastorall staffe. Reade the booke from the beginning to the ending. And therefore this is a false and untrue report." Of course Cartwright, in his reply, could say nothing here. Hence the *Defense of the Answer* has, "This is confessed by silence, and therefore, here the *Admonition* conteyneth a manifest untruth, and wanteth a proctor." Violent party-spirit is very liable to such rebukes; often assuming unfounded things to prejudice an adversary.

[4] *Ib.* 227.

[5] *Ib.* 228, 246, 254.

[6] *Ib.* 256.

[7] *Ib.* 261.

get thee hence[1]." Edification is in no such distinctions, but a "shew of evil, seeing the Popish priesthood is evil; discord is wrought, Gospel-preaching is hindered," "the memory of Egypt," and of former abominations is kept up, "the ministry is brought into contempt, the weak are offended, the obstinate encouraged[2];" ministers are said formerly to have "preached the world only, as God gave utterance: now they read homilies, articles, injunctions, *&c.*[3]" Formerly, the ministry "was painful, now, gainful: then, poor and ignominious, now, rich and glorious[4]." It raises men to "livings and offices, by Antichrist devised, but in Christ's word forbidden, as Metropolitan, Archbishop, Lord's Grace, Lord Bishop, Suffragan, Dean, Archdeacon, Prelate of the Garter, Earl, Count Palatine, Honour, high Commissioner, Justice of the Peace[5]." Scripture would have "seniors in every church, the Pope hath brought-in the lordship of one man over sundry churches, yea, over many shires[6]." Primitive usage demands "equality of ministers, instead of an archbishop, or lord bishop[7]." These two, with all their inferior officers, "are drawn," both as to name and function, "out of the Pope's shop;" and the canon-law which guides them, is "Anti-christian, devilish, and contrary to Scripture[8]." Their power is no more warranted by God's word, than the Pope's, dominion of one minister over another, being "unlawful and expressly forbidden" by Holy Writ[9].

From the clergy, the *Admonition* passes-on to the Liturgy, first complaining, as an innovation, of any written trammels for ministerial devotion[10]. Exceptions are then taken to prayer against tempest, when none seems at hand; to the *Magnificat*, and other scriptural hymns, as introduced for no conceivable purpose but to honour the Virgin, the Baptist, or similar personages, therefore profanations of Scripture; to baptism by women, or deacons; to the administration of sacraments in private places, and to the churching service, as "smelling of Jewish purification[1]." Holidays are denounced as Popish, sermons in defence of established institutions and ceremonies, are invidiously contrasted with doctrine purely scriptural[2].

---

[1] *Admonition.* Whitgift's *Defense*, 284. [2] *Ib.* 286, 292, 293, 295. [3] *Ib.* 296. [4] *Ib.* 297. [5] *Ib.* 298. [6] *Ib.* 455. [7] *Ib.* 456. [8] *Ib.* 460. [9] *Ib.* 464. [10] *Ib.* 488.

Excitement being vitally important to Puritanism, even administration of the sacraments without preaching, is disparaged. Mere reading is pronounced no "feeding," but as bad, or worse, than stage-playing, because actors learn their parts. Many of the clergy, it is asserted, could scarcely read what was prescribed, with book before them. "These," it is immediately added, "are empty feeders, dark eyes, ill workmen to hasten the Lord's harvest, messengers that cannot call, prophets that cannot declare the will of the Lord, unsavoury salt, blind guides, sleepy watchmen, untrusty dispensers of God's secrets, evil dividers of the Word, weak to withstand the adversary, not able to confute." In fine, reading ministers are placed upon a level with Popish priests, whose pastoral qualifications were deemed sufficient, when they could fairly go through that which lay before them in the service-book[3].

The diaconate, as established in the national church, is denounced as a "foul" perversion. In primitive times every church had its deacons, but only as collectors and dispensers of alms; now, their office is "a step to the ministry, nay rather, a mere order of priesthood[1]."

---

[1] *Admonition.* WHITGIFT'S *Defense*, 494, 503, 511, 515, 537.

[2] *Ib.* 538, 558.

[3] *Ib.* 562, 579, 580.

Objections to the communion-service are hastily prefaced by the groundless mention of an *introite*, originating with Pope Celestine. Primitive usage is then pronounced adverse to the reading of "fragments" from the epistle and gospel, and of the Nicene creed. But it is claimed for the examination of communicants. The prevailing usage of administering with wafer-cakes, next comes under animadversion; nor does the prescribed posture of receiving escape; sitting, it is maintained, being that of antiquity. Fault is found with the prescribed words, as having Papistical additions to those which our Lord used, and as having *Take thou, eat thou*, instead of *Take ye, eat ye*. Other discrepancies from primitive communions are found, in the hymn, *Glory to God in the highest*, in the admission of sinners to the table, in the pomp of administration, and in every particular which our Lord is not known to have instituted[2].

In baptism, exceptions are taken to surplices, the interrogatories, the sponsors themselves, fonts, and the sign of a cross; which last is stigmatised as the "superstitious and wicked institution of a new sacrament[3]."

After this long array of objections, the monitors tell Parliament, "Instead of chancellors, archdeacons, officials, commissaries, proctors, doctors, summoners, churchwardens, and such like, you have to place in every congregation, a lawful and godly seignory[4]." Discipline was to be administered chiefly by three orders, namely, ministers, that is to say, preachers, or pastors; seniors, or elders;

---

[1] *Admonition.* WHITGIFT'S *Defense*, 584, 586, 689.
[2] *Ib.* 588, 589, 591, 593, 596, 600, 601, 602, 603, 605.
[3] *Ib.* 607, 617.
[4] *Ib.* 627.

and deacons: a form of government superseded by the Pope[1]. In primitive times, when it existed, just sentences were pronounced, as might be expected from "a zealous and godly company," but "hatred, favour, affection, or money," may and do warp the judgments of individuals[2]. The ancient phrase was, *Tell the Church*, the modern, "Complain to my lord's grace, primate and metropolitan of all England, or to his inferior, my lord bishop of the diocese, if not to him, shew the chancellor, or official, or commissary, or doctor[3]." The rule of "lord bishops," their inferior officers, "and such ravening rablers," is denounced as most horrible, "spoiling the pastor of his lawful jurisdiction over his own flock, given by the word, thrusting away most sacrilegiously that order which Christ hath left in his church, and which the primitive church hath used[4];" which is no other than "the regiment of ministers, seniors, and deacons jointly[5]."

To account for their former use of the Common Prayer, more or less completely, the monitors declare their conformity, such as it was, to have flowed from a desire of peace, accompanied with reverence for the times and persons that gave rise to the book. Subscriptions now required, oblige them to pronounce it, "an unperfect book, culled and picked out of the Popish dunghill, the Mass-book, full of abominations," and containing "many things against the Word of God[6]."

Complaints are then made of the Homilies, of lessons from the Apocrypha, of using the term *priest*, of the matrimonial ring, as a sacramental sign, of the words *With my body I thee worship*, as making the woman an idol, and of the injunction to receive the communion at weddings[1]. Confirmation "by the bishop alone to them that lack both discretion and faith," is said to be superstitious, and not agreeable to the Word of God, but Popish and peevish[2].

---

[1] *Admonition.* WHITGIFT'S *Defense.* 629, 632.

[2] *Ib.* 654.

[3] *Ib.* 662.

[4] *Ib.* 671.

[5] *Ib.* 694.

[6] *Ib.* 709.

The burial service is mentioned as if thought unnecessary, every Christian, and not ministers only, being concerned in burying the dead. The office, it is alleged, maintains prayer for the dead, as may be "partly gathered out of some of the prayers[3]."

Exceptions are also taken against various passages in the Prayer Book, and among them, against praying that "all men may be saved[4]." The Psalms are said to be "tossed in most places like tennis balls," and Sunday amusements, immemorially in vogue, are invidiously mentioned as if chargeable upon the ecclesiastical authorities[5]. Cathedrals are stigmatised as "Popish dens," which, together with the queen's chapel, by their organs and curious singing, "must be patterns and precedents to the people of all superstitions[6]." The monitors add, "We should be long to tell your Honours, of cathedral churches, the dens aforesaid of all loitering lubbers, where Master Dean, Master Vice-Dean, Master Canons, or Master Prebendaries the greater, Master petty Canons, or Canons the lesser, Master Chancellor of the Church, Master Treasurer, or otherwise called Judas the purse-bearer, the chief chantor, singing men, (special favourers of religion,) squeaking choristers, organ-players, gospellers, pistellers, pensioners, readers, vergers, *&c.* live in great idleness, and have their abiding. If you would know whence all these came, we can easily answer that you they came from the Pope, as out of the Trojan horse's belly, to the destruction of God's kingdom[1]."

---

[1] *Admonition.* WHITGIFT'S *Defense.* 715, 721, 723.

[2] *Ib.* 725.

[3] *Ib.* 727.

[4] *Ib.* 739.

[5] *Ib.*

[6] *Ib.* 743.

God's word, it is alleged, forbids the union of civil offices with ecclesiastical. Hence clergymen must not have their prisons, "as Clinks, Gatehouses, Colehouses, towers, and castles. This is to not have keys, but swords[2]." The monitors then say, "Birds of the same feather are covetous patrons of benefices, parsons, vicars, readers, parish-priests, stipendiaries, and riding chaplains, that under the authority of their masters, spoil their flocks, of the food of their souls: such seek not the Lord Jesus, but their own bellies; clouds that are without rain, trees without fruit, painted sepulchres full of dead bones, fatted in all abundance of iniquity, and lean locusts in all feeling, knowledge, and sincerity[3]."

Subscription to the doctrinal articles is approved, though not altogether without reserve. Claim is made for "a godly interpretation in a point or two, which are either too sparely, or else too darkly set down." The monitors, accordingly, refer their strivings and sufferings wholly to resistance of Popery, and a refusal "to be stung with the tail of Antichristian infection." They conclude with imploring Parliament, for the sake of God's church, and of the queen, to consider and reform the abuses pointed out, so that "Antichrist might be turned out headlong, and Christ might reign by his word[4]."

---

[1] *Admonition.* Whitgift's *Defense.* 744.

[2] *Ib.* 749.

[3] *Ib.* 774.

[4] *Ib.* 776. Neal thus makes the best of the case: "It contains the platform of a church, the manner of electing ministers, their several duties, and their equality in government. It then exposes the corruptions of the hierarchy, and the proceedings of the bishops,

This mass of encroaching intolerance, captiousness, inaccuracy, envy, and scurrility, was treated by the government as a seditious libel. Its authors ostensibly, and, perhaps, principally, were John Field and Thomas Wilcox, two Puritanical clergymen of great note among the Londoners of their party. They must have been committed to Newgate, almost immediately after the *Admonition* was published, for they jointly addressed an elegant Latin letter to Burghley, soliciting liberation, on the 3rd of September. They admit their authorship of the offensive publication, which is called *a book requiring the reformation of horrid abuses*, and they ridiculously claim credit for appealing to Parliament, instead of attempting to correct, or innovate, by their own authority. They lay religious dissension entirely upon the hierarchy, and seem to fancy that peace would immediately follow upon its destruction[1]. Their friends naturally viewed them as martyrs, and they were gratified by an abundance of

---

with some severity of language." (*Hist. Pur.* i. 252.) The reader is not supplied with any specimen of this *severity*. "It avowed distinctly, and in no measured terms, unceasing hostility to the constitution of the Church. Rejecting all disguise, it spoke out freely the language of strong conviction, tinctured with somewhat of that bitterness, which has too generally characterised the controversies of the Church. The publication of this treatise may be regarded as one of the earliest steps towards the union of the Puritans and the patriots; the advocates of spiritual freedom and the defenders of civil liberty. The close and faithful union of these two parties enabled them to check the despotism of Elizabeth, and utterly to overthrow that of the Stuarts." (PRICE's *History of Protestant Nonconformity*. Lond. 1836. i. 227.) That advantages to freedom, both civil and religious, grew out of the Puritanical struggle, is undeniable; but the Puritans meant none to either, only the transfer of despotic powers both civil and religious to their own *elderships*.

[1] STRYPE. *Annals*. ii. Append. XIX. p. 482. "Two divines, Field and Wilcox, who were principally concerned in drawing it up, were sent to Newgate, July 7, 1572, and in the following October were indicted on the Statute of Uniformity, and sentenced to one year's imprisonment."—PRICE. 231.

visitors[1]. Occasionally, they had to receive such as were no admirers. One of these, Pearson, chaplain to the archbishop, animadverted upon the intemperance of their *Admonition*. Field immediately took the blame of this wholly upon himself, pleading Scripture, in justification, and necessity for conceding forbearance no longer[2]. If passion may interpret one, and judge of the other, social offences must hardly be mentioned again.

Mere severity was justly thought unlikely to check the Disciplinarians. Hence Archbishop Parker determined upon a literary examination of their cherished *platform*[3]. His secretary wrote out a fair copy both of the principles, and the abuse, contained in the *Admonition*, most probably from a draught of his own[1]. He seems to have selected John Whitgift, master of Trinity college, Cambridge, eventually occupant of his own chair, to work upon these materials. Before the year closed, Whitgift's *Answer to the Admonition* appeared. Cartwright had now returned from abroad, and a reply from him followed quickly upon the heels of Whitgift's piece. He did not place his name at length before it, but only initials, T. C. No concealment, however, seems to have been intended. He stood forward as champion of the *Admonition*, and is often loosely named as if its author. Whitgift had shown no fear of him, at Cambridge, and none appeared now. He soon published a *Defense of the Answer to the Admonition*. This work contains, distributed in paragraphs, the *Admonition* itself, the author's reply to it, Cartwright's answer to him, and his own rejoinder. This important volume is, therefore, a view of the whole controversy, composed in the fairest manner. Cartwright has repeatedly been represented as beaten by it completely out of the field. He did not, in fact, make a full reply, until after an interval of four years, when he had again gone abroad, and Whitgift, newly entangled by episcopal cares, was no longer at leisure for controversy[2]. Thus the book

---

[1] Strype. *Parker*. ii. 240.

[2] He said: "This concerns me. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testament use such vehemency: we have used gentle words too long; which have done no good: the wound grows desperate, and wants a corrosive: it is no time to blanch or sew pillows under men's elbows, but God knoweth, we mean to touch no man's person, but their places and abuses." (Neal. i. 252.) "This John Field, whilest he lived, was a great and chief man amongst the Brethren of London, and one to whom the managing of the Discipline, for the outward practice of it, was especially by the rest committed. So all the letters that were directed from the brethren of other places, to have this, or that, referred to the London assemblies, were for the most part directed unto him."—Bancroft. *Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline.* 295.

[3] "In this treatise," (the *Admonition*) "such a hardy spirit of innovation was displayed, and schemes of ecclesiastical policy so novel and extraordinary, were developed, that it made a most important epoch in the contest, and rendered its termination far more improbable. The hour for liberal concessions had been suffered to pass away; the Archbishop's intolerant temper had taught men to question the authority that oppressed them, till the battle was no longer to be fought for a tippet and a surplice, but for the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy, interwoven as it was with the temporal constitution of England." (Hallam's *Constitutional Hist.* Lond. 1832. i. 252.) Scholarly exposure does not seem the weapon for an "intolerant temper." Nor is it likely, that any "concessions" would have been ultimately found satisfactory, less "liberal" than an unconditional surrender of ecclesiastical patronage, ecclesiastical revenues (including those of the monasteries), and inquisitorial powers, into the hands of nine, or ten thousand intolerant elective bodies, controlled and directed by

---

a central elective body. It is true, that all these pretensions did not come out at once, but they did not come out at all, until the cherished pattern, Geneva, had afforded precedents for the whole system. "A few concessions at the commencement of the Queen's reign would have satisfied such men as Fox, Coverdale, and Humphrey; but the battle was now to be fought on other ground, and for an object immeasureably more important." (PRICE. i. 230.) The parties named might have been "satisfied with a few concessions," which their followers would soon have found of no great importance, while a "battle was to be fought" for wealth and power.

[1] STRYPE. *Annals*. ii. 275. pt. 2. Append. XIX. p. 476.

[2] Whitgift was consecrated to the see of Worcester, at Lambeth, on

might fail of its predecessor's notoriety, both from the author's absence, and his opponent's silence. His work, undoubtedly, has escaped some of our older church-historians, who claim the last word for Whitgift[1]: no great credit in a controversy; for angry spirits rarely rest without it.

Whitgift's party considered his replies no less triumphant, than they were learned[2]. The Disciplinarians felt equally certain that victory lay with Cartwright[3]. His

---

Sunday, April 21, 1577.—STRYPE. *Whitgift*. i. 80.

[1] "In the year 1573, Dr. Whitgift published his *Defense* against Cartwright's *Reply*.—Two years after (1575) Mr. Cartwright published a *Second Reply* to Whitgift's *Defense:* it consisted of two parts, the first was entitled *The Second Reply of* T. C. *against Dr. Whitgift's Second Answer touching the Church Discipline.*—The second part of Cartwright's *Reply* was not published till two years forward, when he was fled out of the kingdom: it is entitled *The Rest of the Second Reply of Thomas Cartwright against Master Doctor Whitgift's Answer, touching the Church Discipline. Imprinted* 1577.—Thus ended the controversy between these two champions: so that Fuller, Heylin, and Collier must be mistaken, when they say, Whitgift kept the field, and carried off a complete victory, when Cartwright had certainly the last word."—NEAL. i. 265.

[2] "Whitgift replied again to Cartwright, and had the thanks of the bishops and the Queen, who, as a reward for his excellent and learned pains, made him dean of Lincoln; while Cartwright, to avoid the rigour of the commissioners, was forced to abscond in friends' houses, and at length retire into banishment."—*Ib.* 259.

[3] "Dr. Whitgift's book was answered by Mr. Cartwright, whose performance was called a masterpiece in its kind, and had the approbation of great numbers in the university of Cambridge, as well as foreign divines." (*Ib.* 258.) "Mr. Cartwright maintained, that the holy Scriptures were not only a standard of doctrine, but of discipline and government, and that the Church of Christ, in all ages, was to be regulated by them. He was, therefore, for consulting his Bible *only*, and for reducing all things as near as possible to the apostolical standard. Dr. Whitgift went upon a different principle, and maintained, that, though the holy Scriptures were a perfect rule of faith, they were not designed as a standard of church-discipline, or government; but that this was changeable, and might be accommodated to the civil government we live under; that the apostolical government was adapted to the Church in its infancy, and under persecution, but was to be enlarged and altered, as the Church

influence among them, indeed, became boundless. They termed him their "most reverend brother, Master Cartwright," and introduced his name into their prayers[1]. A congregation no sooner heard of his deliverance from prison, than it "had Psalms of thanksgiving, prayers to the same purpose, and a sermon[2]." The books of T. C., as they were familiarly called, were deemed necessary for "coming to the knowledge of the truth[3]." One admirer compliments them as "the rare bird's books[4]." Another thought of him, as the queen of Sheba did of Solomon[5]. A third maintains roundly that "the form of government set down by T. C." was "commanded by God[6]." More extravagantly still, one writes, "As the disciples, in times past, had the Lord himself among them, so I have Mr. Cartwright, my lord, in presence with me[7]." Very competent scholars, however, entertained no high opinion of him. When his fame was only budding, Jewel could see nothing in an attack that he made upon archbishops and archdeacons, but the rashness of a novice[8]. Youth, no

---

grew to maturity, and had the civil magistrate on its side. The doctor, therefore, instead of reducing the external policy of the Church to Scripture, takes into his standard the four first centuries after Christ; and those customs he can trace up thither, he thinks proper to be retained, because the Church was then in its mature state, and not yet under the power of Antichrist."—NEAL. 259.

[1] Chap. to F. 1585. *ap.* BANCROFT. *Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline.* 299.

[2] M. R. to F. *Ib.*

[3] Gelli. to F. 1586. *Ib.* 300.

[4] C. Garron to Field. *Ib.* 301.

[5] Farmer to Little. 1586. *Ib.* 300.

[6] Fen against Bridge. *Ib.*

[7] M. Cholm. to Field. 1582. *Ib.* 301.

[8] "Upon occasion offered to shew his opinion concerning one of Cartwright's propositions, *viz. That both the names and offices of archbishops and archdeacons are to be abolished*, he presumed, forsooth, upon the base authority of all antiquity, the antient Fathers, the general councils, and ecclesiastical histories, to call it, in the margent of his answer, *Novitiorum assertio, a new assertion*, or *an assertion of younglings:* and in the end, after he had briefly surveyed the strength of Cartwright's great bulwark, he concludeth in

doubt, was commonly the mainspring of Puritanism. But human nature, committed publicly in early life, will seldom meet a thorough retractation afterwards. Cartwright, accordingly, like most gainers of premature celebrity, never suffered experience to modify his original positions. He failed, however, of giving them any additional weight in the estimation of scholars. Whitaker characterised his second *Reply* as loose and puerile, rather an abuse of words, than an array of matter[1]. Probably, Whitgift was of the same opinion, and therefore, easily dissuaded from prolonging the controversy by a sacrifice

---

this sort: *As for these reasons, in my judgement, they are not made to build up, and they are too weak to pull down. Stultitia nata est in corde pueri, et virga disciplinæ fugabit eam. It is but wantonness, correction will help it.* Whereupon in cometh Cartwright, as hot as a toast, and scorning, ye may be sure, to have such a main article of the new belief to be termed *novitiorum assertio*, he calleth these words biting and sharp, and for his further entrance to confute the Bishop's reasons why he misliked the said proposition, he naileth, as it were, upon his tombe, this shameful and most slanderous inscription, *Bishop Jewel calleth the doctrine of the Gospel wantonness.* Mark the man's forehead how it is hardened. The Papist, that said he recanted all his writings against the Pope, was not more impudent." (*Ib.* 285. Strype. *Whitgift.* Append. x. iii. 21.) The learned and amiable Bishop Jewel had no sooner sunk into a premature grave in his fiftieth year, than "it was widely circulated that he was anxious for retaining the use of the crucifix in public and private devotion: and that in his last hours, the illustrious Apologist of the Church of England had penitently renounced his errors, and wished to die in peace and communion with the Church of Rome." (Le Bas's *Life of Bishop Jewel.* 232.) In the text (Prov. xxii. 15.) cited in Latin, as then usual among scholars, Jewel is thought to have used *pueri*, in the sense of *the lad*, as the language will warrant.—Heylin. *Hist. Presb.* 274.

[1] "I have read a great part of that book which Master Cartwright hath lately published. I pray God, I live not, if I ever saw any thing more loosely written, and almost more childishly. It is true that for words he hath great store, and those both fine and new; but for matter, as far as I can judge, he is altogether barren."—Whitaker to Whitgift, *apud* Bancroft. *Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline.* 303. Paule's *Whitgift.* 21.

of time, that must be inconvenient, and seemed unnecessary[1].

Whitgift admits that a sort of *seignory* existed in the primitive church, but only in large places, and in some instances. He refers it wholly to exigencies created by the want of an establishment, and the danger of persecution. Hence he denies that there is any precedent whatever for even this occasional eldership in a Christian state, much less for the adaptation of such a system to every particular parish; and he maintains its total incongruity with monarchical institutions[2]. This latter objection is tacitly, though intelligibly conceded by the Disciplinarians, and undoubtedly, here lies the main secret of many a bias in their favour. The *Admonition* declares that "some must be governed by all, and not all by some[1]." Cartwright reasons: "For as the house is before the hangings, and therefore the hangings which come after, must be framed to the house which was before; so the Church being before there was any commonwealth, and the commonwealth coming after, must be fashioned and made suitable unto the Church[2]." This democratic tendency of the *platform* naturally drove its opponents towards the other extreme. Cartwright spoke of a monarchy as "a mixed estate." Whitgift replied by charging him with ignorance, adding, "*That* is called a monarchy, where the chief care and government of the commonwealth is committed to one, as it is in this kingdom, in every respect[3]." Princes, with their flatterers, and expectants, interpret such words as an approval of arbitrary rule, and look favourably upon the party that utter them. Opposite principles gain free reception from aspiring spirits with humiliating prospects. Many who had no chance or thought of their own admission into the *seignory*, would eagerly advocate its establishment, because it struck at the root of hereditary power. Its inquisitorial, haughty, selfish character, might easily be discerned[4]. Its real

---

[1] "But Master Cartwright, glorying belike to have the last word, published a second reply, fraught with no other stuff than had been before refuted: yet Doctor Whitgift addressing himself to answer it, was by the advice of some, whose judgements he much esteemed, dissuaded from troubling himself in refuting that which he had already overthrown."—PAULE'S *Whitgift*. 20.

[2] From 1 Tim. v. 17, *Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine*, it was thought conclusive that St. Paul recognises both *ruling* elders and *preaching* elders. Whitgift brings commentators to testify that some ministers anciently administered the sacraments, who did not preach, and he denies that any evidence exists for proving the non-preaching elders in this text, to have been laymen. (*Defense*. 627.) His chief admission is the following passage upon this text, which he cites from Ambrose: "*The Synagogue, and after, the Church, had Seniors, without whose councell nothing was done in the Church.* But that was before his time, and before there was any Christian magistrates, or any Church established." (651.) Cartwright alleges that Jerome is also in his favour. Whitgift gives the passage, and thus translates it: "*And we have in the Church, our Senate, a company of elders*, which he meaneth of priests, and of colleges of cathedrall churches, that were then in every citie, and not of a seignory in every congregation, whereby every severall parish was governed." (652.) In the following passage, Whitgift comprehensively discovers his views upon this question: "Neither did I meane that in everie particular parish, there was such a Seignorie, but in every chief citie, nor that it was at all times in persecution, and where there was no Christian magistrate, but sometymes: neither that this kind of government must be in suche times, but that it may be." (633.) He seems to consider that a body of this kind might be useful in repressing im-

---

morality where the civil government was not organized upon Christian principles.

[1] *Second Admonition*, page 55. *apud* Whitgift. 657.

[2] T. C. *apud* Whitgift. 646.

[3] *Ib.* 650. The authors of the Admonition say: "The moe that rule, the better it is."—*Ib.*

[4] "The Elder's office was to admonish secretly those that did amisse, to comfort those which he sawe weake and shaking, and to have neede of comfort, to assist the Pastor in ecclesiasticall censures of reprehensions, sharper or mylder, as the faultes required; also to assist in the suspensions from the Supper of the Lorde, untill some triall were had of the

nature, indeed, was that of the popedom, but seated at every man's door, and constantly menacing an inroad into every man's private chamber[1]. The people generally

---

repentance of that partie which had confessed himself to have offended, or else if he remayned stubborne, to assist him in the excommunication." (T. C. *apud* WHITGIFT. 634.) Bishop Madox well observes upon the *platform*: "A man knows not what laws or canons, what established rules, or settled ordinances, he is to be try'd by. These lay elders are to judge, as they say, according to the Word of God, their *own sense* of it, they always mean. What this sense may be, or how it may vary, who can answer? By this means, a few tradesmen in cities, or farmers in country parishes, may brand a man as a sinner or a heretic, being judges of opinions as well as actions, according to their own arbitrary and sovreign determination." (*Vindication*, against Neal. 96.) "And what is this but to erect a *High Commission* in every parish? Not forty-four, whom Mr. N. complains of, but half-a-dozen sovreign judges are to proceed against a party accused by one of themselves, by any ways and means they can invent, and upon any maxims of their own which they are pleased to call Scripture." (*Ib.* 98.) "But still, says our author, the hierarchy of the Church, imperfect as it was, is much better than the Geneva model, or what the Puritans called their *Holy Discipline;* which Mr. N. will not debate, being no more fond of ecclesiastical power, or oaths *ex officio*, in the hands of lay elders, than in a Convocation, or Bishop's court." (*Review of the Principal Facts objected to the first vol. of the History of the Puritans:* by Daniel Neal, M.A., Lond. 1734. p. 35.) Thus the Puritans contended for that which their own historian will not waste a moment in defending, although he can be very severe upon the queen and the hierarchy for opposing them.

Ruling elders, in independent circumstances, were to serve gratuitously. "But where the Elders are poor men, so as their attending upon their offices might greatly hinder them, then Mr. Cartwright hath decided the question, and affirmeth by St. Paul's rule (as he saith), *that they ought to be plentifully maintained by the church.*"—BANCROFT'S *Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline.* 184.

[1] "Fourthly, it bringeth in a new Popedome and tyrannie into the Church, for it giveth to the Pastor and his fellow seniors, authoritie to exercise discipline by excommunication, or otherwise, against prince, nobles, and whosoever, being of that congregation. So that unlesse the prince and nobles be, as it were, at their becke, and ready at all times to accomplish their desire, they will sende out their thunderbolts of excommunication agaynst them, even as the pope was wonte to doe, after he had gotten that jurisdiction into his hande that this Seignorie claymeth."—WHITGIFT. 657.

would have been far from finding this authority more tolerable, because exercised by pontifical boards instead of individual pontiffs[1]. They would have been galled more sorely, because the commissioners were their own neighbours, acquainted more or less minutely with their own affairs, and liable, at least colourably, to charges of envy, censoriousness, resentment, or partiality. Such a system might be endured for a time, in an inferior town like Geneva[2]. It was obviously unfit for the exclusive and inexorable occupancy of an extensive kingdom[1]. Its admirers, indeed, represented it as actually established in France and Scotland, which they characterized as "the best reformed countries[2]." But France was really in the

---

[1] "The disciples of Cartwright now learned to claim an ecclesiastical independence, as unconstrained as the Romish priesthood in the darkest ages had usurped. *No civil magistrate in councils or assemblies for church matters*, he says in his Admonition, *can either be chief moderator, over-ruler, judge, or determiner; nor has he such authority as that, without his consent, it should not be lawful for ecclesiastical persons to make any church orders or ceremonies. Church matters ought ordinarily to be handled by church officers. The principal direction of them is by God's ordinance committed to the ministers of the church, and to the ecclesiastical governors. As these meddle not with the making civil laws, so the civil magistrate ought not to ordain ceremonies, or determine controversies in the church, so long as they do not intrench upon his temporal authority. 'Tis the prince's province to protect and defend the councils of his clergy, to keep the peace, to see their decrees executed, and to punish the contemners of them; but to exercise no spiritual jurisdiction. It must be remembered*, he says in another place, *that civil magistrates must govern the church according to the rules of God, prescribed in his word, and that as they are nurses, so they be servants unto the church: and as they rule in the church, so they must remember to submit themselves unto the church, to submit their sceptres, to throw down their crowns before the church, yea, as the prophet speaketh, to lick the dust of the feet of the church.* It is difficult to believe that I am transcribing the words of a Protestant writer; so much does this passage call to mind those tones of infatuated arrogance, which had been heard from the lips of Gregory VII., and of those who trod in his footsteps."—HALLAM. *Const. Hist.* i. 254.

[2] The following is Archbishop Bancroft's account, confirmed by references to Calvin's epistles, of the establishment of the disciplinarian *platform*, in Geneva. The ancient episcopal sovereignty of that city being overthrown, and decried as unlawful, Calvin framed for the Genevans some new system of ecclesiastical authority. This lasted only nine months, when he, with Farel and Viret, were expelled the state, because

---

"they would have been tyrants over a free city; they would have recalled a new papacy." The memory of Calvin's abilities, and some judicious letters that he wrote, procured his recall to Geneva, in 1541. He then concerted his famous *platform*, and, after very great exertions, established it. Religious authority was to be exercised by six ministers, chosen for life, and twelve laymen, chosen annually, though "not out of the baser sort of the people, but out of the civil councels of the city, all of them to be statesmen." The ministers being irremoveable, more highly-qualified than their lay coadjutors, and very careful "to win the people unto them," obtained a complete ascendancy over this body, which became more powerful than any other in the place. Its recognised functions were, indeed, purely religious; but by treating this and that, as "an offence to the godly," hardly anything escaped its interference. —*Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline.* 15, 19.

[1] "The scope of Cartwright's declaration was not to obtain toleration for dissent, not even, by abolishing the whole ecclesiastical polity, to place the different professions of religion on an equal footing, but to substitute his own model of government, the one, exclusive, unappealable standard of obedience, with all the endowments, so far as applicable to its frame, of the present Church, and with all the support to its discipline that the civil power could afford."—HALLAM. *Const. Hist.* i. 256.

[2] "Is reformation good for Fraunce, and can it be evill for England? Is discipline meete for Scotlande, and is it unprofitable for this realme?" (*Admonition.* WHITGIFT. 702.) Whitgift answers, "Englande is not bound to the example, eyther of Fraunce or Scotlande: I woulde they both were, if it pleased God, touching religion, in that state and condition that Englande is." (*Ib.* 704.) T. C. then says, "And whereas he would privily pinche at the reformation there, for so muche as the Lorde hath humbled the one, and exerciseth the other by civill warres and troubles, he shoulde have, in steade of rocking us asleepe in our securitie, put us in remembrance of God's scourges which hang over us, and of God's great pacience that still tarryeth for our repentance, and that he have punished that people of his, which have suffered so much for the profession of the Gospell, and which went with so straight a foot in it, with an universall hazarde of their goods and lives, that we shall not escape unlesse we repent speedily of our coldnesse and halting in religion."—*Ib.* 704.

grasp of Rome, neither church, nor court, nor the people generally, having gone over to Protestantism. Scotland contained a very limited community, and was in a most unsettled state. Still these favourite instances, although unable to bear strict examination, were amply sufficient for encouraging popular principles. The French Hugonots were bearding both church and court. The Scottish Presbyterians were lords of their country. Such pictures acted unfortunately upon English opponents of the *discipline*. They could often see nothing in Puritanism but democratic selfishness, which they would willingly crush under the weight of an arbitrary prerogative. Thus their principles could be colourably denounced as equally injurious to Gospel truth, and English liberty.

Contemporaries of the Marian martyrs naturally thought of them upon a question described as vital to sound religion[1]. The *platform*, however, vainly sought authority among those venerated names. Its advocates allowed no importance to this mortifying defect. Admissions of utter inferiority to the men who had suffered so heroically, were freely made, but coupled with assertions, that, in omitting all mention of the *holy discipline*, they had fallen into an oversight[1]. In one remarkable instance, the Disciplinarians themselves were betrayed into palpable inconsistency. They could not bear the thought of clergymen acting as lords of parliament, members of the high commission court, or justices of the peace, but they reckoned upon the central board of their party, which was to sit in London, for watching town-constituencies with a Puritanical bias[2]. Thus, one function, expected of the chief metropolitan seignory, was properly that of an election committee to keep up a certain party in the House of Commons. It is equally true, and honourable to the Puritans, that politics never predominated in their movements, under Elizabeth. A government less watchful and vigorous than hers, might have tempted them into the loss of this advantage to themselves and their cause.

---

[1] "If the degree and jurisdiction of an Archbishop were no hinderance to B. Cranmer, in the ende of his worldly pilgrimage, nor a rochet sat so harde on B. Ridley his shoulders, but he was able with the same to climbe even to the highest step of martyrdome, if the Prieste's gown which he ware even to his death, were chaunged into the robe mentioned in the Revelation, and his tippet turned into a crowne of immortalitie: to be short, if these garments were thought not unworthy to be worne at the wedding of the lamb, and the greatest part of those which watered the profession of their fayth with streames of blood, acknowledged the Bishop's due preheminence, christened with godfathers and interrogations, buried the dead, preached funerall sermons, ministered the communion kneeling, and to be shorte, strictly and exactly performed all things prescribed in the booke of common prayer, (which opprobriously they terme a very unperfect booke, picked out of the Popyshe dunghill,) we must require some respite for a time to stay and suspend our judgement upon these grave and learned examples, till equall proofe may purchase equall credite."—WHITGIFT'S *Defense of the Ecclesiasticall Regiment in Englande, defaced by* T. C. *in his Replie agaynst D. Whitgifte.* Lond. 1574. p. 190.

---

[1] "It seemeth unto many that it is not like to be good which was not found out by those excellent personages." "The omitting of these necessarie things ought to be no more prejudice agaynst them, or agaynst those that preferre them, than the omitting of the celebration of the feast of tabernacles, so many hundreth years, by so many good high priests, in the reignes of so many good kings, was prejudiciall to the ministers whiche caused it to be celebrated, when the people returned out of their captivitie." (T. C. *apud* WHITGIFT. 8.) The replier corrects Cartwright, in this alleged instance, proving from the original text, the best versions, and commentators, that the feast of tabernacles had not been omitted, but only that it was celebrated under Nehemiah with unprecedented solemnity.

[2] "I hope you have not let slip this notable opportunity of farthering the cause of religion, by noting out all the places of government in the land, for which burgesses for the Parliament are to be chosen, and using all the best means you possibly can, for the procuring the best gentlemen of those places, by whose wisdom and zeal God's causes may be preferred. Confer among yourselves how it may best be compassed. You are placed in the highest place of the church and land, to that end, even to watch for all occasions of procuring good, and preventing evil. Quit yourselves worthily."—D. Chap. to Field. *apud* BANCROFT. *Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline.* 294.

As the most sanguine disciplinarians could see no immediate prospect of superseding the national church by their cherished *platform*, a presbytery was formed clandestinely at Wandsworth, in Surrey. An obscure village, on the river's bank, within five miles of town, was highly inviting to a society demanding both present secresy, and metropolitan facilities for influencing the country. Field was, besides, lecturer of Wandsworth, though resident in London[1]. Thus a party of parishioners and neighbours was already formed upon the spot, which only awaited organization, and might easily be visited, when this point was gained, by admirers from town. Eleven lay elders were formally appointed, on the 20th of November: but matters appear to have been pretty well arranged, some months earlier[2]. Wandsworth has, accordingly, the distinction of giving birth to the first English presbytery, and the example rapidly proved infectious. A record was provided, endorsed by Field, *The Order of Wandsworth*, in which the ruling elders' names were found, the mode of their election was declared, their duties were methodically prescribed; and two neighbours, Smith of Mitcham, and Crane of Rochampton, were mentioned as approvers of the scheme . This reduction of the *discipline* to a tangible form, naturally fired kindred spirits with emulation, and the government seems to have become soon aware of some increased activity among the

---

[1] Fuller. *Ch. Hist.* 103.

[2] "Mr. Field being present at the formation of this society, it must have taken place before July 7, as on that day he and Mr. Wilcox were committed to prison, where they were detained till the close of 1573, at the least."—Price. *Hist. Prot. Nonconf.* i. 237. note.

[3] Bancroft. *Dangerous Positions.* Lond. 1640. p. 43.

Puritans. A proclamation was issued, enjoining that the laws for maintaining uniformity in public worship should be strictly executed; and that the two *Admonitions to the Parliament*, "with all other such scandalous books and pamphlets, should either be delivered to the bishops in their several dioceses, or to some lord of the council, under pain of imprisonment[1]." Puritan movements were only so far affected by this demonstration of authority, as to wrap themselves in more impenetrable caution. The high commission obtained information of the Wandsworth presbytery: the names of its members baffled inquiry[2].

Puritanism was now regularly entered upon a second stage. Hatred of a few vestures and ceremonies had grown into hatred of the hierarchy: nothing would satisfy a party, eminent for zeal, importantly graced by learning and talent, but servile deference again to a foreign ecclesiastical authority. The Romanist might be easily shown that papal influence had flowed wholly from position, uneradicated Paganism, and dexterous policy. It was equally easy to show the Puritan, that Calvin's discipline sprang from his peculiar circumstances. Interest, passion, and prejudice, allowed neither party to look steadily at facts. Nothing was to dwell upon the mind, but acceptable assumption, and argument sophistically built upon it. The Romanist would only hear of a divine charter vested in the Pope. The Puritan flew off with disgust and indignation, under any refusal to recognise his adored platform of discipline, as an integral portion of evangelical truth. His opinion, once rooted in the soil, took effective hold of English perseverance, and bent the energies of many an active mind to plant a Wandsworth in every corner of the land.

---

[1] HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 273.

[2] NEAL. i. 266.

CHAPTER IV.

LAST YEARS OF ARCHBISHOP PARKER, AND FIRST YEARS OF ARCHBISHOP GRINDAL.

1573—1579.

PURITANICAL CONFERENCES — CHARK — DEERING — ROYAL PROCLAMATION AGAINST PURITANICAL USAGES AND BOOKS — BIRCHET'S OUTRAGE—ORDER FOR CARTWRIGHT'S APPREHENSION—THE PROPHESYINGS — IMPOSTURES AMONG THE PURITANS — DEATH AND CHARACTER OF ARCHBISHOP PARKER — TWO FOREIGNERS BURNT FOR HERESY — ARCHBISHOP GRINDAL — WENTWORTH'S PARLIAMENTARY LICENSE—ARTICLES PASSED IN CONVOCATION—SUPPRESSION OF THE PROPHESYINGS, AND SUSPENSION OF ARCHBISHOP GRINDAL — GILBY — BROWNE — DEAN WHITTINGHAM'S ORDINATION QUESTIONED — HAMMOND BURNT FOR HERESY, AT NORWICH—CRUEL USAGE OF STUBBE—SACRAMENTS ADMINISTERED BY DEPUTY AMONG PURITANICAL INCUMBENTS — SERVICES OF PURITANISM IN UNDERMINING ROMISH PREJUDICES.

THE Wandsworth presbytery really originated in London. The capital, as a place of resort for all England, naturally became the centre of Puritanical movements. Meetings of the disaffected party had long been secretly holden there, under the name of *Conferences*. In these, originally, little was debated but subscription, ministerial vestures, and the Liturgy[1]. New members infused far wider views. They spurned such a niggardly measure of reform, maintaining that evangelical obligation would allow no rest, until the established hierarchy had been superseded by the Genevan *platform*[2].

---

[1] "As it appears by testimony upon oath of one, then of their party." — BANCROFT. *Dangerous Positions*. 44.

[2] "Marry, after, saith he, that Charke, Travers, Barber, Gardner, Cheston, and lastly, Crooke and Egerton, joined themselves unto the brotherhood, then the handling of the *discipline* began to rise." —*Ib.*

Among the recruits from a distance thus animating the London *Conferences* by a more stirring spirit, the first who became conspicuous was William Chark, fellow of Peterhouse, in Cambridge, and chaplain to Henry, Lord Cheney. He closely followed up the Wandsworth experiment, by a violent attack upon the hierarchy, from the University pulpit. As he afterwards pleaded, it was undoubtedly some extenuation of his intemperance that it did not explode in a popular form[1]. It was veiled in the Latin of a *concio ad clerum*. But expectations were evidently raised of something very different from the dull formality, usually characterizing such a discourse[2]. Nor did Chark disappoint the most sanguine anticipations of disciplinarian zeal. The church, he maintained, in a very confident tone, was indebted to Satan, for bishops, archbishops, metropolitans, patriarchs, and popes. His corollary naturally was, that one minister ought not to be superior to another[3]. An university preacher could not be tolerated in thus aspersing his country's religious polity. Chark was convented before the vice-chancellor, and the heads of houses. He was reminded, that such propositions could hardly be mooted with any publicity, without serious mischief, and earnest persuasions were used to obtain a retractation. He stood, however, stifly upon his opinions, and treated some of the heads with contemptuous insolence. Being too much embarrassed by the strength of his party to resent, three or four of them undertook the hopeless task of conferring with him privately. Even then he was allowed until Ash-Wednesday, for consideration; and on that day, time was farther offered, until Easter[1]. But scorning to give the slightest prospect of a change, he was immediately ejected from his fellowship, and expelled the university by an unanimous vote[2]. Such penalties were statutably provided, in case of refusal to retract any public attack upon established institutions, whether ecclesiastical or civil[3]. By these severities Cambridge Puritanism was exasperated, rather than checked, or daunted. Chark himself lost none of his noble friends: as chaplain to the duchess of Somerset, he found a luxurious home, and such of his qualities as were really useful, an honourable field[1].

---

[1] "That when he was well aware, how this opinion of himself and others might be with danger divulged among the unskilful multitude in sermons, because it had something new to the common people, and different from the ordinances of the state, he kept to himself the knowledge of the truth, and ever studiously had abstained from the promulgation of it in his sermons. But that in a private senate, and in the Latin tongue, he thought he might use greater liberty. And therefore he had, in the university, in a very learned and wise assembly, explained his opinion more freely in these matters." (Chark to Lord Burghley.—STRYPE. *Whitgift.* i. 91.) The *clerum* was preached in December, 1572.

[2] "Omitting the great expectation of many long before his sermon, raised (as may probably be thought,) by some speech given out by him concerning those things whereof he would entreat." The Vice-chancellor and Heads of the University of Cambridge, to the Lord Burghley, their High Chancellor. Mar. 2, 1572 (1573). *Ib.* Append. XI. iii. 25.

[3] "I. Episcopatus, archiepiscopatus, metropolitanatus, patriarchatus, et papatus, a Satana in Ecclesiam introducti sunt. II. Inter ministros Ecclesiæ non debet alius alio esse superior."—STRYPE. *Parker.* ii. 194.

---

[1] The vice-chancellor and the heads merely say, "We graunted him more than seven weeks space." Strype says, "The time prefixed for him was Ash-Wednesday following."—*Parker. ut supra.*

[2] The Vice-chancellor, *&c.* to the Lord Burghley. — STRYPE. *Whitgift.* Append. XI. iii. 25.

[3] "*De Concionibus. Prohibemus, &c.* We do forbid that no person in any sermon to be handled, and common-place, or public readings, or otherwise, publicly within our university, teach, handle, or defend anything against religion, or any part of the same, received and established by public authority, in our kingdom; or against any statute, authority, dignity, or degree, either ecclesiastical or civil, of this our kingdom of England, or Ireland. Whosoever shall do the contrary, shall revoke and publicly confess his error or rashness, by the command of the Chancellor, with the assent of the major part of the heads of colleges. But if he shall refuse, or shall not proceed humbly after the manner it shall be prescribed him; let him be, by the same authority, for ever excluded from his college, and banished the University."—STRYPE. *Whitgift.* i. 90.

Another leading Puritan, now brought into trouble, was Edward Deering, sprung from an ancient Kentish family, and educated at Christ's College, in Cambridge. His natural talents, being diligently cultivated, and adorned by spotless morals, were highly effective in the pulpit. But he borrowed seasoning for his sermons, from a rustic bluntness[2], and from invectives against the church's constitution. He began, as usual, with objections to cap, surplice, and tippet; and he rapidly glided with the stream into abhorrence of the hierarchy. None commonly are more impatient of wealth and station in professional men, than such men of family, who have not gained these distinctions themselves. If Deering's mind, however, were warped by anything external, he was, probably, unaware of it, regarding himself merely as a zealot for evangelical truth, when he was inflaming popular ignorance and envy against established usages and authorities. As lecturer of St. Paul's he had an opportunity of doing so much mischief, that it was deemed unsafe to let him proceed unmolested. Being summoned before the privy council, he seems to have displayed the rashness of indiscreet zeal, and the honour of gentlemanly breeding; making such concessions and admissions as neither cool judgment nor vulgar artifice would have allowed. The result was a suspension from his lecture. This naturally occasioned clamour, and Edwin Sandys, then bishop of London, thought it most politic to have him restored, on an understanding that he would avoid polemics, and confine his future discourses to topics of general edification[1]. His adherents were delighted, proclaiming that the queen and council were favourable to him, and that he had merely been the victim of episcopal oppression. The archbishop, in fact, evidently disapproved his restoration, and the terms, in which it was conveyed, seem to have been such as the bishop of London would not have sanctioned[2]. It soon appeared a hasty concession, and new indiscretions brought Dering before the Star Chamber, to answer a string of twenty interrogatories[1]. His replies were characterized by a tone of moderation, but marked with invincible repugnance to the hierarchy. He had, indeed, adopted an opinion, that "the lordship, or civil government, of bishops is utterly unlawful;" and when reminded that Cranmer and other martyrs must have thought otherwise, he answered, "The Lord had not revealed it unto them, but left them in that infirmity, as He left many of his saints before them in as great[2]." However well-disposed at bottom, Dering laboured under violence of temper, and Archbishop Parker, no incompetent judge, considered him deficient in learning[3].

---

[1] Strype. *Whitgift.* i. 92.

[2] "Once preaching before Queen Elizabeth, he told her, that when in persecution under her sister, Queen Mary, her motto was, *Tanquam Ovis*, As a Sheep, but now it might be *Tanquam Indomita Juvenca*, As an Untamed Heifer."—Fuller. *Ch. Hist.* 109. Walton's *Life of Hooker*. Oxf. 1824. 141.

---

[1] "Falling unto consideration of such speche as passed from Mr. Derying of late before the Lordes of the Counsayl, I evidently see, that he, upon grete simplicitie, hath cast himself into grete danger: a wel advised man would not have made such an unadvised offer. If it wold please your good Lordship to procure the consent of the Counsayl that he might be released thereof, and suffered to reade his lecture, so that he only teache sound doctrine, exhort to virtue, and dehort from vice; and touching matters of order and pollecy, meddle not with them, but leave them to the magistrate, to whome reformation pertaineth: as I thinke he wold yilde therunto, so in my opinion to delyver hym from the other, and to bring hym to this, your Lordshippes shuld do that which is fittest for the present time." (The Bishop of London to Mr. Secretary, June 20, 1573. *A Collection of State-Papers, left by W. Cecill, Lord Burghley:* by W. Murdin, Lond. 1759. p. 255.)

The "unadvised offer" mentioned, may, perhaps, refer to a public disputation, then desired by the Puritans. "Sandys, Bishop of London, offered them satisfaction this way, and sent to the Lord Treasurer, and the Earl of Leicester, a list of the names of those he thought proper for the managing this controversy. But the Lord Treasurer did not think it prudential that a public settlement should be exposed to question, and referred to the hazard of a dispute."—Collier. ii. 542.

[2] "We have sent unto you certain articles taken out of Cartwright's book, propounded unto Mr. Dering, with his answer to the same: and also a copy of the Council's letter writ to Mr. Dering to restore him to his former reading and preaching, notwithstanding our advices never required thereunto. These proceedings puff them up with pride, make the people hate us, and magnify them with great triumphing, that her Majesty and the Privy Council have good liking of this new building." The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London to some Ecclesiastical Commissioner of their own order. July 6, 1573. —*Ib.* 543.

The queen's lenity to him was followed almost immediately by a strong demonstration against his opinions. Nothing could shew more clearly the difficulties of her situation than such instances, constantly recurring, of a Machiavellian policy, as the primate expressed himself. A royal proclamation from Greenwich[4], enjoined strict obedience to the *Act of Uniformity*, and ordered every person possessing the *Admonition to the Parliament*, with all other books, defending it, or agreeable to it, to bring them to the bishop of his diocese, or some privy councillor, within twenty days[5]. The time expired, but in London, which notoriously swarmed with such publications, not one reached the diocesan[6]. Elsewhere, it was most probably, much the same, and Elizabeth became irritated. She laid her failure chiefly upon episcopal negligence, and in a second proclamation[1], reflected severely upon the bishops, with other magistrates. All in authority were now to commit such persons as broke the *Act of Uniformity*, until they answered for that offence, by due course of law[2]. A circular to the hierarchy bore upon them with still greater severity; pronouncing their visitations intended for the redress of such evils as disquieted the church, and equal to the purpose; but actually so conducted as to seem little else than devices to collect fees[3]. Immediately afterwards, commissions were issued, under the great seal, to the bishops and others, in the several counties, to hold special courts for the cognizance of such ecclesiastical offences as the queen then had in view. In bringing this measure before the Star Chamber, Burghley attributed much of the mischief to the preferment of clergymen, "young in years, but over young in soundness of learning and discretion[4]." As a remedy, some one proposed that every "minister and preacher" should give bond to the queen, "with two good, sufficient sureties," for 200*l.* to observe the *Act of Uniformity*, and all other canonical sanctions, duly made, or to be made[5]. Such a proposition was plainly impracticable, and all these measures proved ineffective. They shew, however, that obloquy has often been unjustly thrown upon the hierarchy for severity against Puritanism. Nor will Elizabeth be charged with a harshness which she did not consider extorted by the force of circumstances, by those who remember her indulgence upon other occasions.

---

[1] They contain the usual points controverted by Puritans, and may be seen in Strype.—*Annals.* ii. 415.

[2] Mr. Dering to the Lord Treasurer. Nov. 1, 1573.—*Ib.* 401, 412. Dering died in 1576.—FULLER. 109.

[3] STRYPE. *Parker.* ii. 324.

[4] June 11.—*Ib.* 256.

[5] *Ib.*

[6] *Ib.*

---

[1] Greenwich, Oct. 20.—STRYPE. *Parker.* ii. 320.

[2] *Ib.* 321.

[3] Greenwich, Nov. 7. The letter printed is that to the bishop of Winchester, and it is signed by seven members of the privy council. "The like to which was sent to some, if not all other bishops." —*Ib.* 345.

[4] *Ib.* 350. Whitgift also thus remarks upon the youth which was so remarkable a feature in Puritanical movements. "We know how unluckelie Roboam spedde in forsaking his grave and auncient counsell, and following those lustie yonkers, which ledde him by the levell of their rashe conceyte, not by the certentie and assurance of his countrey's vauntage."—*Defense of the Ecclesiasticall Regiment in Englande, defaced by* T. C. p. 192. Burghley's speech was delivered Nov. 28.

[5] STRYPE. *Parker.* ii. 354.

Advantage was rather ungenerously taken by the hierarchical party of an insane outrage, that otherwise would have been long forgotten. Peter Birchet, of the Middle Temple, having heard a sermon from Sampson, at Whittington College, about seven o'clock in the morning[1], in a subsequent part of the same day[2], followed Hawkins, a naval officer of eminence[3], who was riding, in company of others, down the Strand, and stabbed him dangerously. Being quickly apprehended, he was found to have mistaken the unlucky commander, who did not, however, die, for Sir Christopher Hatton, then vice-chamberlain, and captain of the guard, subsequently lord chancellor. Hatton had ever been in opposition to Leicester, and was therefore truly regarded by the Puritans as undermining their influence at court[4]. Birchet had, some time before, exhibited unequivocal symptoms of insanity at a friend's in Dorsetshire[5], and he fancied himself an instrument raised up by Providence to despatch the vice-chamberlain, as an obstacle to God's glory and a maintainer of Popery[1]. The queen seems to have been personally alarmed by this doctrine of murdering for conscience sake; and as the offence actually committed fell short of a capital felony, she hastily had a commission prepared for executing the frantic enthusiast by martial law[2]. She found a precedent in her sister's execution, without regular process, of some who rose under Sir Thomas Wyat[3]. But that gentleman was himself legally tried, and had actually levied war; hence the two cases were not in the least analogous. She yielded accordingly to representations made by some about her person[4], and Birchet was treated less summarily, though no less absurdly. He was sent to Lambeth, and imprisoned in the Lollards' Tower, as a heretic. Being regularly brought before his diocesan, the bishop of London, in the consistory of St. Paul's[1], he justified his murderous delusions, and was on the point of receiving sentence to die for heresy. His courage then seems to have given way, and some learned men persuaded him to renounce his opinions, as erroneous and damnable[2]. Being remanded to Lambeth, after a stay of five days, he was removed to the Tower, there to await such penance as the ecclesiastical authorities should impose. On the following morning, as one of his keepers was reading the Bible at a window, he snatched a billet from the hearth, came behind, and killed him. On the next day he was arraigned at Westminster, for this homicide[3], and within twenty-four hours he was hanged in the Strand[4], at the place where he stabbed Hawkins; his right hand being first stricken off, and nailed to the gibbet. Three successive days of such violent excitement allowed no hope of a lucid interval, however short, and he died under the full influence of his malady, mute, but making all the resistance in his power[5]. Though clearly a maniac, he brought great odium upon Puritanism, his frenzy being represented as nothing else than Genevan principles exhibited in their full proportions. Allowance must, undoubtedly, be made for an age imperfectly acquainted with mental disease, and for the retaliation of men unjustly aspersed. Elizabeth also naturally quailed before the disclosure of such fanaticism. It was very likely to prove infectious. Birchet's case, however, called for strict restraint, not for public execution; and his frantic prepossessions were no dishonour to Puritanical opinions. To those who preached them, some blame might fairly be attributable. In rousing healthier minds to headstrong zeal, a public speaker may blow the spark of madness that lurks in others, into an ungovernable flame. To soar above such discreditable danger, the pulpit should be discreetly filled.

---

[1] Strype. *Parker.* ii. 327.

[2] Oct. 11.—Stowe. 677.

[3] "Sir John Hawkins was born at Plymouth, and had been bred to the sea from his childhood. He was one of the first Englishmen who traded to Guinea, and his voyages laid the foundation of the slave-trade. He was appointed treasurer of the navy this year."—*Queen Eliz. and her Times,* i. 492.

[4] "Sir Christopher Hatton was at that time in especial favour, Vice-Chamberlain, Captain of the Guard, and afterwards Lord Chancellor also: in the whole course of his preferments, of a known averseness to the Earl of Leicester, and consequently no friend to the Puritan faction. This obstacle must be removed one way, or other, according to that principle of the ancient Donatists, for murthering any man of what rank soever, which opposed their practices."—Heylin. *Hist. Presb.* 274.

[5] Strype. *Parker.* ii. 328.

---

[1] "In my simple judgement, being no divine, a private man, being persuaded in his own conceit, by such presumptions and proofs as I have had of Hatton, that such a one as he, as I have thought, is a wilful Papist, and hindereth the glory of God so much as in him lieth; though he may not of his own authority, in the fervency of his zeal, kill the same; yet being so persuaded in conscience by such presumptions and assured persuasions, as he may be, and I was, that thereby he should be such an instrument as Joab was to take away such a Seba (as *Reg. cap.* xx.) or an Ahad to Eglon, or Phineas, for the preservation of David, his royal prince, the wealth of his country; especially for the glory of God, as I was, I think, at that time; he may do it, and be warranted by the word of God."—Answers subscribed by Pet. Byrchet, Oct. 27, 1573. STRYPE. *Parker*. ii. 328.

[2] STRYPE. *Annals*. ii. 427. "Her Majestie taketh heavily the hurting of Hawkyns, and sent her own surgeons to him, and Mr. Gorge, to visite and comfort hym. It will sone appeare whether he can escape or no. Neither her Majestie, nor almost any one here, can thynke otherwise, but that there is some conspiracie for that murder, and that Burchet is not indeede mad." Sir Thomas Smith to Lord Burghley, Oct. 15, 1573. —*Queen Elizabeth and her Times*, i. 492.

[3] *Hist. Ref.* iv. 121.

[4] "The Earl of Sussex, lord chamberlain, and the lord admiral were much against it."—STRYPE. *Annals*. ii. 427.

---

[1] Nov. 4. STOWE. 677.

[2] *Ib.*

[3] "He confessed the fact, saying that Longworth," the murdered keeper, "in his imagination, was Hatton."—NEAL. i. 271. A MS. is cited.

[4] Nov. 12.—STOWE. 677.

[5] *Ib.* Heylin characterises this execution as "a piece of justice, not more safe, than seasonable; the horridness of the fact, and the complexion of the times, being well considered." (*Hist. Presb.*) Neal, though as much of a partisan, shews the improvement in public opinion and information, which had been wrought between his time and Heylin's. He truly says of Birchet, "if he had been shut-up in Bedlam, after his first attempt, as he ought to have been, all further mischief had been prevented." (i. 271.) "Mr. Garret told me that he had been with one or two gentlemen that came out of the west countrey to London with Burchet, who declareth that he had many phantasticall speeches and doings, whereby they might perceive that he was not well in his witts, all the whole journey hitherwards."—Smith to Burghley, *ut supra*.

To the fear of assassination, engendered in Elizabeth and her advisers, by this fatal ebullition of insanity, may be, probably, attributed an order for the apprehension of Cartwright[1]. As the age forced Puritanism to bear the whole blame of Birchet's violence, it must naturally have seemed neither safe nor reasonable, to overlook any longer the main-spring of opinions deemed so dangerous. But Cartwright's friends enabled him to elude pursuit, and nothing was publicly known of him, until he had found a secure retreat upon the continent[2].

---

[1] Dec. 11, 1573.—STRYPE. *Annals*. ii. 419.

[2] "The malevolence of Cartwright's enemies was unsatisfied, while he retained his liberty. It was not enough in their estimation to deprive him of his academical rank and emoluments, to banish him from the university, and to prohibit his writings as seditious and heretical, a warrant was now issued for his apprehension, signed by Sandys, the bishop of London, and eleven others of the high commission. But he happily escaped to the continent; where he remained for some years actively engaged in the service of religion." (PRICE. *Hist. Prot. Nonconf.* i. 257.) In a note is the following extract from a letter

The *prophesyings* were now become very general and popular. Elizabeth saw this with uneasiness and displeasure, esteeming any benefit likely to flow from them, more than counterbalanced by their obvious tendency to encourage Puritanism[1]. Among the bishops a different opinion prevailed. Some of them were favourable to Puritanical views, and none could overlook the need of greater clerical intelligence and learning. The queen was naturally less aware of such deficiencies, and chiefly thought of reigning over a peaceful and united people. She declared accordingly, to Parker, her utter dislike of the *prophesyings*, with a desire that he would make this known to the bishops of his province, and concert measures for suppressing these obnoxious exercises. The royal pleasure does not, however, seem to have been communicated in a regular, official form: hence the archbishop sought an indirect, irresponsible mode of

---

from Wilcox to Gilby, Feb. 2, 1574. "Our brother Cartwright is escaped, God be praised, and departed this land, since my coming up to London, and I hope, is by this time at Heidelberg." Among the signatures to the warrant for Cartwright's apprehension, besides that of Sandys, are those of Nowell and Goodman. The latter had been abundantly conspicuous for Puritanical partialities, and the former was not without such. "Malevolence," indeed, appears fairly imputable nowhere, in this case. The order might be unwise, and probably was.

[1] "The Queen was told by the Archbishop that they" the prophesyings, "were no better than seminaries of Puritanism." (NEAL. i. 286.) STRYPE'S *Parker*, 461, is cited. We read there, "The Queen, hearing how they were managed in the diocese of Norwich, utterly disliked them." The recent historian of Nonconformity has omitted this unwarranted instance of Neal's antipathy to Parker. "Notwithstanding the benefits which accrued to the church from these exercises, they were represented to the Queen as engendering a spirit of enquiry hostile to the church, and favourable to puritanism." (PRICE. i. 289.) To mention "the benefits which accrued to the church," is begging the question. She never had anything to fear from "a spirit of enquiry" fairly conducted. It was a spirit of misrepresentation working upon the passionate and ignorant, that rendered the *prophesyings* objectionable.

acquainting his brethren with it. The diocese of Norwich, early conspicuous for a Protestant bias, had now become extensively Puritan. John Parkhurst, the bishop, an exile under Mary, was decidedly partial to that school of theology. One of his clergy, named Matchet, was chaplain to the primate, who desired him to inform Parkhurst of the queen's wish to have these *vain prophesyings* immediately suppressed[1]. Irregular in all its parts as the order was, Parkhurst raised no objection to it on that account. But he found a loop-hole in the word *vain*[2], assuming that nothing was intended against any *prophesyings* to which that term would not apply. Upon the strength of this quibble, he wrote to certain of the privy council, and received a reply signed by four of that body[3], approving of the exercise so long as "no seditious, heretical, or schismatical doctrine, tending to the disturbance of the peace of the church, can be proved to be taught in the same." Parker was no sooner apprised of this, than he dropped his reserve, desiring the bishop of Norwich to impart his warrant for disobeying her Majesty's command, signified to himself for transmission through the province of Canterbury. Parkhurst wrote to Sandys, bishop of London, one of the four privy-councillors[4], who had approved regulated *prophesyings*. Of the answer nothing is known, but the bishop of Norwich lost no time in forbidding the exercise[5]. In most other parts of the kingdom it evidently continued[6]. Nothing was against it, but an unofficial intimation of the queen's pleasure, and even those days were above treating this with implicit attention. Elizabeth herself, too, had always the good sense to yield, when convinced of its expediency. She had none of that dogged obstinacy, which weak minds take for firmness.

---

[1] STRYPE. *Parker*. ii. 359.

[2] The epithet appears to have Archbishop Parker's own.—*Ib.* 360.

[3] Dated May 6, 1574.—*Ib.* 361.

[4] The other three were Sir Thomas Smith, Sir Walter Mildmay, and Sir Francis Knollys.

[5] From Ludham, through his chancellor, June 7. Bishop Parkhurst, born at Guildford, and educated at Merton college, Oxford, a good Latin epigrammatist, and a very excellent man, died in the following winter, aged 63.

[6] Orders for its regulation, in

An attempt was made, about this time, upon the venerable primate, probably for interested purposes. His steward received information of a pretended conspiracy to despatch him, with Burghley, and some other persons of eminence. The disclosure was accompanied by offers of money to the steward himself, if he would come into the plot. As a communication of this kind was not likely to be unattended with devices for securing attention, the archbishop became alarmed, and seems to have suspected Leicester of abetting the supposed conspirators. The queen, too, was impatient for a full detection. When, however, the informant came to be examined before the privy council, his intelligence was found wholly fictitious[1].

Hertfordshire, were issued by the bishop of Lincoln, Oct. 26, 1574. —STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. 476.

[1] "Parker's zeal against the puritans betrayed him sometimes into great inconveniences; like a true *inquisitor*, he listened to every idle story of his scouts, and sent it presently to the Queen or council; and the older he grew, the more did his jealousies prevail. In the month of June one of his servants acquainted him, that there was a design of the *Puritans* against the life of the lord treasurer and his *own;* and that the chief conspirator was one *Undertree*, encouraged by the great Earl of *Leicester:* the old archbishop was almost frighted out of his wits at the news, as appears by the following passage in his letter to the treasurer: *This horrible conspiracy*, says he, *has so astonished me, that my will and memory are quite gone; I would I were dead before I see with my corporal eyes that which is now brought to a full ripeness.* He then prays that the detector of this conspiracy may be protected and honourably considered, and the conspirators punished with the utmost severity; otherwise the end would be worse than the beginning. And that he might not seem to express all this

The infamy of this contemptible imposture recoiled upon its wretched inventor; some others brought real obloquy upon Puritanism. Two young females, one of them a mere child, had been detected in pretending to suffer under a demoniacal possession, and did penance at St. Paul's cross[1]. Impositions of the same kind occurred contemporaneously at Norwich, and in Kent[2]. Notoriety in such cases is, indeed, sure to render them infectious. Most young people are vain, and some are mendacious, to a degree little suspected by the bulk of their elders. Hence a spoiled youth with an active imagination, is easily lured into a promising exhibition, however unlimited may be its calls upon invention. The juvenile candidates for public notice, in the present year, were of Puritanical connections, and one of them had a memory well stored with Scriptural texts. This was a

---

concern for his own safety, he tells the treasurer, that it was for *his* sake and the *Queen's*, that he was so jealous, *for he feared that when rogues attempted to destroy those that were so near her Majesty's person, they would at last make the same attempt upon her too, and that even some that lay in her bosom* (*Leicester*) *when opportunity served, would sting her.*" (NEAL. i. 292.) The spirit of this extract requires no comment. Against its accuracy nothing is to be said, but that Parker had no information implicating Leicester. He merely suspected that hostile nobleman's privity. The tale itself he was bound in duty to sift: nor was he lowered by an appearance of personal apprehension, if he really felt any. Human nature is liable to be thus affected. But he professes to be chiefly anxious for the safety of Burghley, and the queen, and the maintenance of public tranquillity. An aged clergyman, dying under the stone, may, surely, be believed in making this reasonable profession. No rich man is secure from experiments upon his pocket by skilful impostors.

[1] Aug. 15. One of the parties was about twenty, the other, eleven or twelve.—STOWE. 678.

[2] The present case occurred at Westwell, the pretender being illegitimate daughter of a woman there. Two years before, a young Dutchman of twenty-three had acted the demoniac at Maidstone. Ten devils were said, in a book published about it, to have been dispossessed from him, by the mighty providence of God.—STRYPE. *Annals*. ii. 484.

Norwich boy of thirteen, or fourteen, who declared himself possessed by a devil just ejected from a girl, some three or four years older. Bishop Parkhurst, then near his end, and probably rather sinking into premature dotage, gratified the actors in these lying fooleries, and their silly friends, to their hearts' content. He despatched an account of the girl's case to Bullinger, in Switzerland. For the boy's relief, public prayers were ordered in the city, and fasting until even[1]. In other places interest and importance were given to these wretched farces, by the attendance of Puritanical ministers; who naturally reaped for their pains, the infamy of being reputed confederates in the imposture. They were, however, most probably, weak men really deceived, although more than ordinarily easy of belief, because tempted by an attractive opportunity for displaying the strength of their prayers. It is a proof of their discernment and integrity, that the leading Puritans were no parties to these experiments upon popular credulity[2].

Archbishop Parker, now far advanced in years, was rapidly sinking under distressing attacks of gout and stone. His energy continued unimpaired. Information having reached him of great clerical irregularities in the Isle of Wight, and some other portions of Winchester diocese, he undertook, by the bishop's desire, a metropolitical visitation[3]; which was followed by general preparations for conformity[1]. A degree of severity might have been necessarily used or threatened, and Leicester's influence appears to have been sought. Elizabeth, evidently, persuaded that the primate had acted with some indiscretion, commanded his attendance, and surprised him by an expression of displeasure[2]. Parker

---

[1] STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. 484.

[2] "The Papists have been frequently and justly blamed for their impostures in this thing, and no terms are thought vile enough to express their falsehoods. But they were only *pious frauds* in the Presbyterians, because conducing to such godly and religious ends, in the advancing of the sceptre and throne of Christ, by the holy discipline. And it is strange that none of their zealots have endeavoured to defend them in it." —HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 278.

[3] "My visitation in Winchester diocese, which was the device of the Bishop." (Archbishop Parker

---

to the Lord Treasurer, April 11. STRYPE. *Parker.* Append. XCIX. iii. 422.) Robert Horne was this bishop. He, probably, found himself hardly equal to repress these disorders, or unwilling to incur the odium of it. Pains were, however, taken afterwards to make him regret his call for the primate's interference. He was told by some one, thought to be Leicester, that "his clergy were sifted, and that the thorn was put in his foot, but that he" (the speaker,) "would pluck it out that it should be so in other men's feet, that they should stamp again." (Archbishop Parker to Lord Burghley, *ubi supra.*) Neal says nothing of Bishop Horne's "device" to call in the primate, but citing only Strype, thus represents this transaction. "One of the last public acts in which his grace was concerned, was visiting the diocese of Winchester, and in particular, the isle of Wight, in 1575, and here he made use of such methods of severity, says Mr. Strype, as made him talked against all over the country. This island was a place of resort for foreign Protestants and seafaring men of all countries, which occasioned the habits and ceremonies not to be so strictly observed as in other places, their trade and commerce requiring a latitude. When the archbishop came thither with his retinue, he gave himself no trouble about the welfare of the island, but turned out all those ministers who refused the habits, and shut-up their churches." (*Hist. Pur.* i. 294.) In the recent opportunity given to Dissenters for judging of the Church of England, we read: "But the archbishop was now approaching to the termination of his career. The bitterness of his zeal, however, continued undiminished. One of his last acts was the visitation of the diocese of Winchester, particularly of the isle of Wight, which gave rise to general complaint, and was censured even by the queen. The fretfulness of age had, probably, soured his temper, and given an unexampled severity to his proceedings." —*Hist. Nonconf.* i. 290.

[1] "My visitation wrought such a contentation for obedience, that I do not yet repent me of it."—Archbishop Parker to Lord Burghley, *ubi supra.*

[2] "Clamours against him arrived at the ears of his old back friend, the Earl of Leicester; who presently, glad of any opportunity, laboured to blacken him before the Queen for this visitation." (STRYPE. *Parker.* ii. 423.) "Her Majestie, this other daye, when I was at Richemond at her com-

himself, looking only to the need and effect of his interference, remained perfectly satisfied that he had merely done his duty. The operation of this final labour was, however, checked by his death, which occurred at Lambeth, on the 17th of May[1]. He closed a difficult,

---

mandment, sodenly charged me for my visitation. I think I know from whence it came, and who did enforme one nobleman to open it unto her."—Archbishop Parker to Lord Burghley, *ubi supra.*

[1] At the age of seventy-two. He sank under disease of the urinary passages. "Archbishop Parker, by far the most prudent churchman of the time." (HALLAM. *Const. Hist.* i. 159.) Toleration "was vain to expect from the queen's arbitrary spirit, the imperious humour of Parker, and that total disregard of the rights of conscience which was common to all parties in the sixteenth century." (*Ib.* 247.) "The archbishop's intolerant temper had taught men to question the authority that oppressed them." (*Ib.* 252.) "The haughty spirit of Parker." (*Ib.* 262.) Yet Mr. Hallam says of the *prophesyings*, "Many will be of opinion that Parker took a statesmanlike view of the interests of the church of England in discouraging these exercises." (*Ib.* 267.) The archbishop, indeed, appears to have been generally "prudent," and "statesmanlike," in his views. Nor will the deference justly due to a very able writer, warrant implicit acquiescence in the severity with which he sometimes mentions a resolute, but modest man, placed in very difficult circumstances. The following is Neal's character of Parker. "He was a severe churchman, of a rough, uncourtly temper, and of high and arbitrary principles both in church and state; a slave to the prerogative and the supremacy, and a bitter enemy to the Puritans, whom he persecuted to the length of his power, and beyond the limits of the law. His religion consisted in a servile obedience to the Queen's injunctions, and in regulating the public service of the Church: but his grace had too little regard for public virtue; his entertainments and feastings being chiefly on the Lord's-day: nor do we read, among his episcopal qualities, of his diligent preaching, or pious example." (*Hist. Pur.* i. 299.) The archbishop did, probably, offend against the correcter notions of modern England, as to Sunday. But Neal's Puritanical friends must share the blame of this. Their views upon the Lord's day, which, undoubtedly, have been of great national service, were not perfectly developed until many years after Parker's death. Mr. Price says of him: "He was a severe churchman, whose notions of religion were restricted to the maintenance of its forms. Mistrusting the stability of his church, he was perpetually alarmed for its safety, and unscrupulously employed in its support every means which force or fraud could sup-

upright life, with all the foresight, firmness, and complacency, that marked a vigorous, equable, and religious mind. A natural gravity had kept him, even in youth, from spectacles, games, and field-sports. His memory was naturally odious to the Puritans, and has ever been roughly treated by Dissenters. But Parker was really, in private, strictly moral, accessible, liberal, and methodical. As a public man, plain good sense, command of tongue and temper, laborious diligence, cautious decision, depth of penetration, and unity of purpose, appear to have been his characteristics[1]. He had, as we have already seen, neither any superstitious reverence for the externals that he enforced, nor much tenderness for scruples that could make such things important. He thought merely of the law, and of the ancient prejudices that rendered it expedient[2]. He was no forward, nor even unreluctant volunteer in enter-

---

ply.—Placed in a station of commanding influence, he prostituted his power to the Queen's prerogative, and the maintenance of ecclesiastical uniformity.—In other circumstances, and with different connections, he might have avoided the oppressions which now constitute his disgrace, and which will hand down his name to the latest posterity, as a persecutor of the saints of God." (*Hist. Nonconf.* i. 293.) "He was a *Parker* indeed, careful to keep the fences, and shut the gates of discipline against all such night-stealers as would invade the same. No wonder, then, if the tongues and pens of many were whetted against him; whose complaints are beheld by discreet men like the exclamations of truantly scholars against their master's severity correcting them for their faults." (FULLER. 108.) The former of these sentences is copied both by Neal and Price, the latter by neither. Archbishop Parker was buried in the chapel of Lambeth House. Colonel Scott, one of the regicides, obtained this mansion, under the Commonwealth, and converted the chapel, Strype says, "into a hall, or dancing room." Parker's remains were then taken up, the leaden coffin sold, and the bones buried in a dunghill. Search being made at the Restoration, the bones were found, and again placed in the chapel.

[1] COLLIER. ii. 549. *De Antiqu. Brit. Eccl.* 558.

[2] See *ante*, p. 19.

ing upon its rigorous execution, but that painful duty having been forced upon him by his superiors, he discharged it steadily to the end of life. Many men, undoubtedly, would have slackened in an irksome course, when sometimes deserted, sometimes thwarted by the very power that had urged them into it. Parker contented himself with complaining of a tortuous policy, that he felt personally unjust and harassing, that was uncongenial to his plain blunt nature, and revolting to his principles. He well knew, besides, that Elizabeth, although seemingly vacillating herself, would bear no vacillation in him. Nor would a scholar's eye, allow him either to doubt the propriety of her determination, or its ultimate success. Having none of the politician's pliancy, his discretion, learning, and integrity failed of securing all their proper weight among contemporaries. The same cause has widely operated to the prejudice of his memory upon posterity.

As a scholar, no studious man denies that he has established an ample title to wealth and station. England owed a revised edition of the vernacular Bible to his pious and learned care[1]. Under his immediate inspection, was compiled a work of considerable importance, illustrating the see of Canterbury from its foundation[1].

---

[1] Some of the exiles at Geneva, in Queen Mary's reign, undertook to revise the English Bible, and the work was incomplete on Elizabeth's accession. This occasioned certain among them to remain abroad until their undertaking should be finished. It appeared in quarto in 1560, and is called from the place of its impression, the Genevan Bible. A second edition was printed at Geneva, in 1561. "From the peculiar rendering of Genesis iii. 7, the editions of this translation have been commonly known by the name of *Breeches Bibles*." (COTTON'S *List of Editions of the Bible*. 14.) The principal undertakers of this work, which strongly savoured of Calvinism, were Miles Coverdale, John Knox, W. Whittingham, and A. Gilby. The proprietors wished to reprint it in England, and applied for the royal protection against piracy. Both Parker and Grindal favoured their application, but the intended volume did not then appear. The archbishop had at the same time in contemplation, a new

---

edition of the Bible for public use; means for supplying the demand for such a book having become extremely insufficient, and objections being urged against the authorized volume, both on account of typographical errors, and mistranslations. To execute this design, he delivered certain portions of Cranmer's Bible to particular bishops, learned chaplains of his own, and other qualified persons, who carefully compared them with the originals. Their united labours were printed in folio, under Parker's superintendence, in 1568, each portion being distinguished by the initials of the divine entrusted with it. As several of these parties were of episcopal rank, the volume became known as the *Bishops' Bible*. It was the authorized version until superseded by that now in use, in 1611; but its popularity never equalled that of the Genevan Bible, which ran through many editions during the latter years of the sixteenth, and the earlier of the seventeenth centuries.—COTTON. STRYPE. *Parker*. i. 413. LEWIS. *Compl. Hist.* 237. *De Antiqu. Brit. Eccl.* 561.

[1] *De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ*. Joscelyn, his secretary, seems to have been the chief actual author of this work, rather than the archbishop himself. Still, it may be fairly considered as his, having been compiled by his means, and under his own eye. Hence he says, "I did of purpose keep back *my* book of my Canterbury predecessors." The work was printed in 1572. Fifty copies are said to have been stricken off, but Drake, to whom we owe the best edition, could find no more than twenty-two. Of these, no two were exactly alike. Parker did not publish the book, but sent copies, at different times, to private friends, and he seems to have been continually altering such as lay by him. The rarity and discrepancy of these copies afforded a colour to Le Quien, in his *Nullité des Ordinations Anglicanes*, published at Paris, in 1725, to maintain that the work was a forgery, with 1572 on the title-page for the sake of imposition, the real date of its printing being many years later. Unluckily for this mode of getting free from unmanageable testimony, the book was actually reprinted at Hanover, in 1605, and is both used and cited by authors before that year. It gave rise, in fact, to a Puritanical attack in 1574. The book is chiefly occupied by biographies of the archbishops of Canterbury. Parker was the seventieth occupant of his see, and the copies of his work that he distributed, naturally contained only the lives of his sixty-nine predecessors. He had written, however, or caused to be written, his own life; which was printed, probably, at his expense, in a folio tract containing twelve leaves and a half. This came into the hands of an enemy, who translated it in an acrimonious style, and published his work under the following title: *The Life of the 70th Archbishopp off Canterbury, presently Sittinge, Englished, and to be added to the*

He procured and overlooked answers both to Sanders, and Cartwright[1]. His patronage carried through the press, and with most scrupulous fidelity, some valuable original pieces of English history. Among these, Matthew Paris, the most spirited, copious, and interesting of monastic chroniclers, confounded Romanists, and astonished every body by bold reflections upon papal avarice and corruption[2]. Theology owes to Parker another, and

---

69, *lately sett forth in Latin. This numbre of seventy is so compleat a number as it is great pitie ther shold be one more: but that as Augustin was the first, so Matthew might be the last. Imprinted* M.D.LXXIIII.—DRAKE. *Ad Noriss. Edit. Præf.* STRYPE. *Parker.* ii. 246.

[1] Of Whitgift's answer to Cartwright much has already been said. Parker revised the MS. before it went to press. To the seventh book of Sanders *De Visibili Monarchia*, anonymous answers were published in 1573, by Ackworth and Clark. The former was entitled *Προλεγόμενα,* the latter *Fidelis Servi subdito infideli Responsio.* Parker speaks to Cecil of Clark, as a *young* man, and his piece bears evidence to this fact, being far too rhetorical.—STRYPE. *Parker.* ii. 179.

[2] Matthew Paris was published in 1571. Baronius, embarrassed by this ancient monk's invectives against Rome, insinuates that his work may have been indebted for them to his heretical editor, people of that stamp having a peculiar talent for depraving such books as they can. Bellarmine says that the book must be cautiously read, many things in it, seemingly, having been added by the heretics to heap odium on the Roman Church. Possevino thinks it worth considering whether the work had not been corrupted by the heretics. Pits will not dare to affirm for certain, whether some things may not falsely be ascribed to Paris. Binius gives a hint of suspected faith. If Archbishop Parker's character had not been sufficient guarantee against these ridiculous insinuations, Dr. Wats, who re-edited Matthew Paris, in 1640, would have effectually demolished them. He has shown by collation of MSS. that the venerable monk of St. Alban's had no injustice done to him in the edition of 1571, and that, consequently, papal readers of his valuable history must be contented to wince. (*Pontificiorum Testimonia Matth. Par. Opp. præfixa:* edit. Wats. Lond. 1640.) Archbishop Parker's other historical publications were, Matthew of Westminster, 1570, Asser and Walsingham, 1574. (*De Antiqu. Brit. Eccl.* 561. STRYPE. *Parker.* ii. 500.) His edition of Matthew of Westminster, of 1570, was, in fact, a reprint attesting the nicest sense of editorial integrity. "Archbishop Parker, Savile, Powel, and Camden, who

most important service, in the publication of Elfric's famous Paschal homily, with extracts from his two epistles[1]. The candid and inquiring were thus presented

---

lived at, or shortly after the period of the Reformation, were deterred from exercising even the slightest discretion upon the authors whom they edited, only because they knew that if they did so, the charge of mutilation would be brought against them by the advocates of the Roman Catholic doctrines; and so careful was Parker to avoid such an imputation, that in 1570, he did not hesitate to give to the world a second edition of the History of Matthew of Westminster, having discovered that the edition which he had published only three years before, had been printed from a comparatively incomplete manuscript." (*General Introduction*, viii. prefixed to STEVENSON'S *Bede*, published by the English Historical Society. 1838.) Had Parker been cut down to the condition for which his Puritanical contemporaries clamoured, and to which envious, proud, narrow spirits would reduce every churchman, the costly reprint would have been out of the question. Unless the classes in which inclination and ability are found, have reasonable access to pecuniary means, the world must see many valuable services imperfectly performed, or miss them altogether. Romanists might securely boast of antiquity, if all who could refute them, were in poverty.

[1] Strype conjectures that this publication appeared about 1566. (*Parker*. i. 472.) As nothing was more calculated to cause astonishment after the constant appeals of Romanists to antiquity, Parker submitted the printed sheets to a careful examination with the original MSS. by the bishops, and other competent witnesses. The signatures of himself, of the archbishop of York, and of thirteen bishops, attesting the exact correspondence of the publication with the originals, appear in the preface, and then we read, "With divers other persons of honour and credit subscribing their names, the record whereof remains in the hands of the most reverend Father, Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury."

The archbishop does not represent Elfric as perfectly Protestant, but says, "In this sermon here published, some things be spoken not consonant to sound doctrine, but rather to such corruption of great ignorance and superstition, as hath taken root in the Church, a long time, being overmuch cumbred with monkery." The miracles introduced, which are the sole comfort of Romanists confronted by Elfric's utter demolition of their vital doctrine, he considers interpolations: "which notwithstanding seeme to have been infarced, for that they stand in the place unaptly, and without purpose, and the matter both before, and after, doth hang in itselfe most orderly." These miracles may be seen in the author's *Inquiry into the Doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 438.

Archbishop Parker also procured, in 1571, the publication of the four Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, with an effectual exposure of Romish claims to antiquity in a vital point. They saw tradition impregnably arrayed against the very doctrine, which hardly even whispers a hope of support from any other quarter. The main pillar of that system, which Englishmen had blindly taken for the ancient religion of their country, was exhibited under demonstrable incapacity of tracing possession up to the earlier half of the eleventh century. In remodelling the Articles, Parker's own hand entered authentically a strong national protest against priestly pretensions to draw down the Deity corporeally from heaven. His publication of Elfric's decisive testimony proved him no rash innovator, a character from which he shrank. It shewed himself, and the martyrs whom he followed, merely to have revived a reasonable belief that all Englishmen had anciently entertained. Parker's good fortune in putting thus to shame, and eventual silence, the idle boasts of Rome, has earnt him a place beside another metropolitan, the illustrious Raban Maur. We know that glory of ancient Mentz to have denounced, as a *novelty* and an *error*, modern Rome's chief dependance, early in the ninth century[1]. Two hundred years later,

---

as an evidence that vernacular Scripture was no novelty in England: ("ut liqueret Scripturas antea fuisse vulgari sermone Anglicano populo notas." *De Antiqu. Brit. Eccl.* 561.) Foxe, the martyrologist, was the ostensible editor of this volume.

As an original author, Parker only produced a learned tract in English, upon priests' marriages. *De Antiqu. ut supra.*

[1] See the author's *Inquiry into the Doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 417. Romanists are in the habit of saying to Protestants, "Your religion is no older than Luther: it is fifteen hundred years too late." They may be answered, "Your religion is no older than Paschasius Radbert: it is eight hundred years too late." To prove the latter answer, Raban's conclusive testimony may be cited. He *must* have known what was a theological *novelty*, in his day. Take away the corporal presence, and what becomes of going to mass? The former answer has no foundation in any man's personal

Elfric displays England denouncing it still as a *novelty* and an *error*. When these facts attain all that attention, which of right belongs to them, and which they must ultimately gain, Parker's name will be remembered as that of one who contributed effectively to disabuse the Christian world. Among benefactors to learning and religion, this archbishop's preservation of ancient manuscripts places him also in a most honourable position. The sordid calculators whose interested support was necessary to carry through the Reformation, cared nothing for scholarly appliances. A convent library often contained materials for extenuating the violence that doomed its dispersion. To this the new possessor would have been keenly alive, had his day resembled ours, in supplying eager purchasers of antiquated literature. As no such class had hitherto arisen, he little valued any records but the title-deeds to his own acquisitions. Parker's mind was cast in a far superior mould. Having both money and influence at command, while monastic stores were still procurable, he proved himself worthy of the trust, by a costly search, under royal authority, for intellectual treasure, lately withdrawn from conventual protection[1]. A large mass rewarded his enlightened muni-

---

knowledge. It is, besides, repudiated as unquestionably false, by all unprejudiced readers of Scripture, and by a large portion of inquirers into ecclesiastical antiquity.

[1] "Senectutem, quam hilarem ac jucundam sensit, in exquirendis accuratioribus doctorum sui temporis sententiis, easque cum antiquioribus auctoribus conferendis, et investigandis antiquissimis veterum scriptorum monumentis nondum editis, et his potissimum, quæ antiquis Britonum et Saxonum temporibus scripta de Anglicana Ecclesia tractant, contrivit. In quibus eruendis, edendis, et conservandis, magnos labores atque sumptus sustinuit. Obtenta enim a regia majestate atque consiliariis assiduis suis precibus licentia, designavit quosdam, quibus authoritatem dabat, eadem per totam Angliam exquirendi et ad se ducendi. Quæ cum nactus esset dispersa et inculta, voluminibus collecta ligari, et membranis legi mandavit."—*De Antiqu. Brit. Eccl.* 561.

ficence, and for it he found an asylum, chiefly in the library of his own college. A small portion he gave to the university of Cambridge[1]. As a whole, this benefaction is incalculably valuable. Some scholarships were also founded by this generous prelate. Such provision for posterity, rebukes the spirit that would keep in poverty all who serve at God's altar, and labour for the souls of men. Divinity has never been allowed something like an equality with other honourable callings, without more than a proportionate return of disinterested and judicious liberality[2]. Had the lay majority been left an entire monopoly of wealth, society would have lost many incalculable benefits which it owes to a learned and munificent clerical minority.

In his last letter to Cecil, Parker mentions a congregation of Anabaptists, recently discovered at Aldgate[3]. Twenty-seven were committed to prison. Four of them, bearing fagots, recanted at Paul's cross[1]. Within a week[2], ten women, and one man, were condemned in the consistorial court of London to be burnt as heretics. Great pains were taken to move them from their opinions, and in the case of one female, with success. The others were sent out of the country[3]. As the whole congregation appears to have consisted of strangers from the Netherlands, it is a pity that any other than the simple expedient of transporting them to the continent was thought of. Perhaps, the government was fully justified in denying them a longer asylum in England, as they held political opinions of a disorganising tendency. The persecution by which they were visited, seems to have revived attention to the family of love, a fanatical sect, also of continental origin, but long seemingly rooted in England, and possessed of some small hold upon the native population[4]. Five of its adherents, all English, were frightened into a public recantation, at Paul's cross[1]. Of the Dutch Anabaptists, one who had undergone this humiliating ceremony seems to have relapsed shortly after[2]. Public opinion called for this miserable foreigner's blood, and he was condemned, with another of his countrymen, to suffer the horrid penalty provided by the common law for heresy. The barbarous writ, *de hæretico comburendo*, had now slept seventeen years, and its reappearance is a foul blot upon Elizabeth and the Reformation. The time was not, however, come, for discerning this obvious truth. Foxe, the martyrologist, indeed, would fain have saved Smithfield from being disgraced anew by the murderous pyre. The queen professed great respect for him, and called him her *father Foxe*[3]. Hence he had no hesitation in writing a Latin letter to her, soliciting mercy for the condemned Netherlanders. But he drops not a hint of toleration. He merely objects to the penalty awarded, as utterly revolting, and properly reserved for a peculiar infamy to Popery, having been invented by Innocent III. He would recommend any punishment short of death, or even hanging, as free from the horror that attends execution by fire[4]. A month's

---

[1] Corpus Christi, or Benet College, the place of his education, and subsequent mastership, had all his books both printed and manuscript, under his will; one hundred volumes excepted, given to the public library of Cambridge.—STRYPE. *Parker*. ii. 439.

[2] A contemporary may here be excused in recording the public spirit that characterised the two last bishops, Barrington, and Van Mildert, who filled the see of Durham before its revenues were curtailed. Their liberality was such, especially that of Bishop Van Mildert (who had no more than a slender private provision), as to throw the munificence of lay proprietors altogether into the shade.

[3] "This great nomber of Anabaptists taken on Easter day, may move us to some contemplation. I could tel you many particularities, but I cease, and charge your Honour to use stil such things as may make to the soliditie of good judgement, and helpe her Majesties good government in princelie constancy, whatsoever the pollicie of this world, yea, the mere world would induce. To dance in a net in this world is but mere vanitie, to make the governance only pollicie is mere vanitie. Her princely prerogatives in temporal matters be called in question of base subjects."—Archbishop Parker to the Lord Treasurer. April 11, 1575. STRYPE. *Parker*. Append. XCIX. iii. 332.

---

[1] May 15. Easter day was April 3. The principles abjured were: "1. That Christ took not flesh of the substance of the blessed Virgin Mary. 2. That infants of the faithful ought not to be baptized. 3. That a Christian man may not be a magistrate, or bear the sword, or office of authority. 4. That is not lawful for a Christian to take an oath."—STOWE. 678.

[2] May 21. *Ib.* 679.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] "About this time began to appear the *family of love*, which derived its pedigree from one Henry Nicholas, a Dutchman. By their confession of faith, published this year, it appears that they were high enthusiasts, that they allegorised the doctrines of revelation, and under pretence of attaining to spiritual perfection, adopted some odd and whimsical opinions, while they grew too lax in their morals, being in their principles something akin to the Quietists of the church of Rome, and the Quakers among ourselves." (NEAL. *Hist. Pur.* i. 297.) Their confession may be seen in Strype's *Annals.* (ii. 577.) Some of them were discovered at Balsham, in Cambridgeshire, in 1574, who had adherents in Essex. They survived through Cromwell's time. The venerable annalist says, "I remember a gentleman, a great admirer of that sect, within less than twenty years ago, told me, that there was but one of the *family of love* alive, and he an old

---

man." (562.) Other *families* also sprang up about this time, as that of the *mount*, that of the *essentialists*, &c. (*Ib.*) Strype thinks that a fanatical sect, which engaged Cranmer's attention in 1552, may be identified, perhaps, with the *family of love*.—*Cranmer*. i. 418.

[1] June 12. The parties "confessed themselves utterly to detest as well the author of that sect, H. N., as all his damnable errors and heresies." (Stowe. 679.) One of the *familists*, named Wilkinson, maintained Arianism, before some people of respectability, at Cambridge, March 24, 1574. (Strype. *Annals*. ii. 486.) This line of opinions appears to have prevailed also among the Anabaptists.

[2] Hendrick Ter Woort, and four other Dutch Anabaptists, named by Strype, had previously recanted. He writes as if these parties were the same that recanted May 15, but Stowe speaks of only four, whom he does not name.—*Annals*. ii. 564.

[3] Fuller. *Ch. Hist.* 105.

[4] "Sunt ejectiones, inclusiones

reprieve was all the indulgence that this letter gained[1]. During that time, the unhappy victims, whose names were John Wielmacker and Hendrich Ter Woort, remained immovable. They were, therefore, inhumanly

retrusæ, sunt vincula, sunt perpetua exilia, sunt stigmata, et πλήγματα, aut etiam patibula; id unum valde deprecor, ne piras ac flammas Smithfieldianas, jam diu faustissimis tuis auspiciis hucusque sopitas, sinas nunc recandescere." (FULLER. *ubi supra.*) Mr. Price thus translates the former clause of this extract: "There are excommunications and imprisonments, there are bonds, there is perpetual banishment, burning of the hand, or even slavery." (*Hist. Nonconf.* i. 295.) By *patibula*, Foxe might seem to mean *gibbets*. In a note, Mr. Price has cited the following from the late Sir James Mackintosh: "All his topics are not, indeed, consistent with the true principles of religious liberty. But they were more likely to soften the antipathy of his contemporaries, and to win the assent of his sovereign, than bolder propositions: they form a wide step towards liberty of conscience." So far, however, is Foxe from taking any "step" at all towards the "religious liberty," and the "liberty of conscience," of later times, that he speaks of the opinions in view, as by no means worthy of civil protection, but requiring to be repressed by fit correction. *Quod igitur ad phanaticas istas sectas attinet, eas certe in republica nullo modo fovendas esse, sed idonea comprimendas correctione censeo.* But he represents death by burning as so horrid, that it never could have been imported into the mild church of Christ, unless by Roman pontiffs, following Innocent III. Cruelty, he says, was so distressing to himself, that he never could even pass a slaughter-house, without a sense of inward pain, and hence he highly valued God's clemency, which forbade the Mosaic victims to be burnt upon the altar, until they were slain. He, therefore, desired above all things, that a punishment so horrible, as the pyre, should be avoided. *Ut vitæ si fieri posset miserorum parcatur, saltem ut horrori obsistatur.*

Toulmin, the editor of Neal, from this lamentable persecution, takes occasion to observe: "One ground of the odium which fell on those who were called Anabaptists, was their deviation from the established creed, in their ideas concerning the person of Christ, and the doctrine of the Trinity; which shews in how very early a period of the Reformation Unitarian sentiments arose among the more thoughtful and inquisitive." (*Hist. Pur.* i. 299. note.) These "more thoughtful and inquisitive" persons, however, are represented by Foxe, in the letter before cited, as wholly foreigners: *Atque equidem hoc nomine Christo gratias quam maximas habeo, quod Anglorum hodie neminem huic insaniæ affinem video.*

[1] FULLER. *ubi supra.*

burnt in Smithfield, uttering piercing cries[1]. As their views were anti-Trinitarian, this foul injustice was approved by every party, save the very small one that agreed with them[2]. Men could see little to regret in the spectacle, but stern necessity calling for it. The age was at fault, not individuals administering its affairs.

---

[1] July 22. (STOWE. 679.) "The privy council would not spare them, notwithstanding the earnest intercession of the Dutch congregation, for divers weighty reasons laid before them. But the chief causes of their execution were, because they would not own them for Christian magistrates, and had been banished a year before."—STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. 564. Dutch MSS. cited.

[2] "All parties, at the time concurred in its approval, though an enlightened posterity now regrets its occurrence, as an indelible blot on the English Reformation." (PRICE. i. 296.) "There were two sorts of Anabaptists that sprung up with the Reformation, in Germany: one was of those who differed only upon the subject and mode of baptism, whether it should be administered to infants, or in any other manner, than by dipping the whole body under water. But others who bore that name were mere enthusiasts, men of fierce and barbarous tempers, who broke out into a general revolt, and raised the war called the *rustic war.*" (NEAL. i. 298.) The attention of government was called to these foreign religionists so early as 1560. A proclamation from Windsor, dated Sept. 22, in that year, after commanding a strict search for such individuals, "willeth and chargeth all manner of persons, born either in foreign parts, or in her Majesty's dominions, that have conceived any manner of such heretical opinions as the Anabaptists do hold, and meaneth not by charitable teaching to be reconciled, to depart out of the realm within twenty days after this proclamation, upon pain of forfeiture of all their goods and chattels, and to be imprisoned, and farther punished, as by the laws either ecclesiastical or temporal, in such case is provided." (STRYPE. *Grindal.* 181.) A second search was made for these people, some years afterwards, and a third in 1568. For prosecuting this last, articles of inquiry were framed to ascertain residence, time of arrival, occupation, moral habits, religious opinions, and attendance either at the parish-church, or one of the regular foreign churches. By a letter of that time from Grindal to Cecil, it seems that there was reason to believe some of these persons to have been guilty of "treasons, murders, felonies, or other such like, committed before their coming over into this realm." (*Ib.* 183.) Such modes of dealing with aliens are not peculiar to Elizabeth's age, and may be found indispensable. In this case (the year 1568) it appeared that some of the Londoners had been perverted by contact with the strangers. (*Parker.* i. 522.) The duke of Alva's atrocities drove a constant succession of refugees into England, and among such a motley

It had been predicted by Dering, with applause from his party, that Parker would be the last archbishop of Canterbury[1]. The Disciplinarians had not, however, to boast of this fruit from their exertions, although Elizabeth was rather slow in filling the vacant see. But her choice fell upon one whom they had openly designated as *their own*[2]. Edmund Grindal, the *Algrind* of Spenser, was born about 1519, at Hensingham, near Whitehaven, like that town, in the parish of St. Bee's, in Cumberland. When Ridley was master, he became fellow of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, and in capacity of chaplain to that venerable martyr, while bishop of London, he was afterwards employed as a preacher in different places. In this, as in the chaplaincy, he was associated with Rogers and Bradford, who went before their common patron to the stake. Grindal, bookish from childhood, appears to have been by far best scholar of the three, and he was marked out for episcopal promotion shortly before Edward's death. When that event blighted his hopes, having fortunately escaped, he rendered abroad great assistance to Foxe, in compiling his Martyrology. Elizabeth's accession brought him home immediately, and he

---

company, some would be found little worthy of protection. Still, this was no justification for burning any of them in Smithfield; but public opinion is responsible for that, and rulers have no means of becoming altogether wiser than the whole body of their contemporaries.

[1] "The 11th day of December, 1572, he said, putting off his cap, Now I will prophesy, that Matthew Parker shall be the last archbishop of Canterbury: or (as it is related in another MS.) that he shall be the last archbishop that shall sit in that seat. *Accipio omen*, quoth Cartwright. The third man said that *they should first rue it*, with other opprobrious words spoke at that time."—Strype. *Parker*. ii. 240.

[2] *Ib.* i. 437.

was one of the eight Protestants chosen to argue against Romanism, at the public conference, holden at Westminster, in March, 1559[1]. Being nominated bishop of London, on Boner's removal, although an advocate abroad for Edward's liturgy, yet he scrupled both at the habits, and exchanges of episcopal lands for impropriate tythes, or the tenths of benefices. An act had recently been obtained, authorizing such transactions with the crown[2], and every appearance indicated a determination to carry it into vigorous execution. Its operation as to tenths, has been to strip Canterbury and London of estates, now producing several thousands a year, supplying their places with fixed payments of inconsiderable amount. As alterations in the value of money have been rapid and striking far above expectation, this disproportion could not have been fully foreseen. It was obviously, however, invidious to make the tythes of several parishes endow a single bishop, and leave a number of vicars with scanty maintenances. Grindal consulted Peter Martyr upon both questions. Of the former, that eminent Florentine thought lightly, the latter, he pronounced liable to no insuperable objection[3]. Grindal, accordingly, became himself a conformist, but he looked with unfailing tenderness upon the scruples of others. He was, indeed, remarkable for mildness of temper, and hence, independently of principle, constitutionally averse from severity. After filling the see of London more than ten years, and with a lenity that Parker thought injudicious, he was translated to York. Something beyond a farther space of five years raised him to Canterbury[1]. No appointment could be more conciliatory. It was one of those numerous acts, which shew the royal councils to have been ordinarily pervaded by anything rather than an unfair spirit towards Puritanism.

---

[1] STRYPE. *Grindal.* 2, 6, 10, 13, 34.

[2] April 6, 1559. "The Bill giving authority to the Queen's Highness, upon the avoidance of any archbishopric, or bishopric, to take into her hands the temporal possessions thereof, recompensing the same with parsonages impropriate, *&c.*, was read *tertia vice et conclusa: dissentientibus Archiepiscopo Eboracen. Episcopis Londin. Wigorn. Coven. Exon. Cestren. Carleol. et Abbat. de Westm.*" (D'EWES. 27.) The "just value" was to be given. "By royal grants under the 1st of Eliz. c. 19, sect. 2, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London were not only exempted from tenths, but authorized to receive the tenths of a certain number of benefices within their respective dioceses, in compensation for certain manors and estates, which at the same time were alienated from the sees."—Report from the Select Committee on First Fruits, *&c. Brit. Mag.* Aug. 1837, p. 193.

[3] "When upon this taking

On the 8th of February, parliament again met, after several prorogations, for the despatch of business. The session is interesting to an inquirer into the progress of constitutional privilege, from a prepared attack upon the queen, delivered on the first day, by Peter Wentworth, member for Tregony. This claimed liberty of speech, and reflected upon former infractions of it, in a strain of boldness to which royal ears were quite unaccustomed[2].

---

away the demesnes of the bishops, and in lieu thereof giving them great tythes (which indeed belonged to parish ministers) Grindal made a conscience what the said ministers should do for a subsistence, since the tythes, their dues, were gone, Martyr soon answered this, *viz.* that they must be maintained by the bishops; and that they must trust God, who would open some way and means to provide for them, seeing he fed the birds of the air, and clothed the lilies of the field, and forsook none rightly walking in their vocation.

"Of the square cap and the external episcopal habits, he thought there was no need much to dispute, when the wearing thereof was without superstition, and especially when it might have a civil reason in this kingdom."—STRYPE. *Grindal.* 45.

[1] Grindal was consecrated to the see of London, at Lambeth, Dec. 21, 1559, translated to York, May 22, 1570, confirmed archbishop of Canterbury, Feb. 15, 1576. Parker "reckoned him not resolute and severe enough for the government of London."—*Ib.* 49, 234. GODWIN. *de Præsul.* 710.

[2] "In later instances, and even in the reign of George the First,

As it was garnished with Puritanical allusions, Wentworth, most probably, meditated some motion agreeable to the Disciplinarians. But his freedom so far outstepped ordinary bounds, that he was interrupted before the conclusion of his speech, sequestered by the House itself, and committed to the Tower. After this display of subservience, Elizabeth saw that she might gain some credit for lenity, without endangering any of her pretensions, if the obnoxious member were only detained sufficiently long in custody. Three days, accordingly, before another prorogation[1], she formally announced her forgiveness of Wentworth, and referred his enlargement to the House. This he did not obtain without undergoing the humiliation of begging pardon on his knees. During his imprisonment, a bill for coming to church and receiving the communion, passed to its second reading in the House of Lords[2], and a petition was presented from the Commons to the queen in council, for reformation of discipline in the Church. This latter, Elizabeth answered by saying, that she had referred such matters to the bishops at the beginning of the session, and that if they failed in doing what was necessary, it should be done by herself in virtue of the supremacy[3]. Thus parliament again separated without effecting anything more for

---

members have been committed for much less indecent reflections on the sovereign."—HALLAM. *Const. Hist.* i. 349.

[1] Wentworth was committed Feb. 9, and enlarged March 12. Parliament was prorogued March 15.—D'EWES. 259, 265.

[2] Feb. 15. A committee was then appointed.—*Ib.* 228.

[3] Feb. 29, a committee was appointed to prepare a petition, which, after report first made to the House, was to be referred to the privy council, by such of the Commons as were also members of that body. The queen's answer to this petition was communicated to the House by Sir Walter Mildmay, chancellor of the exchequer, March 9.—*Ib.* 251, 257.

Puritanism, than keeping alive its hopes, and its exasperation.

The convocation, which sate concurrently with parliament, opened under the presidency of Sandys, bishop of London, arrangements for filling the see of Canterbury bing still incomplete[1]. Grindal, however, appeared as metropolitan within little more than a month, and proposed fifteen articles for synodical consideration[2]. Eleven of these were ecclesiastical regulations. Ordination and institution were to be given to none but subscribers to the Thirty-nine Articles, of canonical age, sufficiently provided with testimonials and scholarship. Unlearned ministers, formerly admitted, were not to be capable of a cure. Licenses for preaching, dated before the 8th of February last, were to be void, but renewable to fit persons without expense or difficulty. Bishops were to keep an eye upon the doctrine of their preachers, and upon the literary progress of their other clergy. The twelfth article allows none but ministers or deacons to baptize privately. The thirteenth and fourteenth refer to penance and occasions of scandal. The fifteenth allows the solemnization of marriage at all times in the year[3]. Perhaps, all these four may be attributed to

---

[1] Strype. *Grindal.* 287.

[2] March 17.—*Ib.* 289.

[3] *Ib.* Append. II. 4. p. 537. Wilkins. iv. 284. Wake. *State of the Church.* 230. The last publication exhibits the Articles as published, with the fifteenth subjoined. Archbishop Wake might seem to have known nothing of the twelfth, relating to private baptism. His twelfth relates to the commutation of penance, which is really the thirteenth. Strype subjoins to the real twelfth, "This article is omitted in the printed copies of these Articles." That the whole fifteen were agreed upon by convocation, there can be no reasonable question, and such omissions in other printed formularies of this reign, take away the importance that has been given to that of the celebrated clause in the twentieth of the Thirty-nine Articles. Heylin mentions more of this kind.

Puritan influence. The last, undoubtedly, may, and it has been cited as a proof of the new archbishop's ill-advised facility[1]. Elizabeth appears to have taken this view. When the Articles were printed, both the twelfth and the fifteenth were wanting, *because, report said*, as to the latter, *our lady, the queen, assented not to the same*[2].

The *prophesyings* had survived Elizabeth's expression of dislike, and were daily gaining popularity. Several bishops looked-on with approbation, esteeming them excellent schools for their clergy[3]. Laymen, however,

---

"When the book was offered to the queen, she disliked this article," (the fifteenth: he too here overlooks the twelfth,) "and would by no means suffer it to be printed among the rest; as appears by a marginal note in the public register of that convocation, which though it might have sufficiently discouraged them" (the Puritans) "from the like innovations, yet the next year they ventured on a business of a higher nature, which was the falsifying and corrupting of the Common Prayer-Book. In which, being then published by Richard Jugge, the Queen's Majesty's printer, and published *Cum Privilegio Regiæ Majestatis*, as the title intimates, the whole *Order of Private Baptism*, and *Confirmation of Children*, was quite omitted. In the first of which it had been declared, *that children being born in original sin, were by the laver of regeneration in baptism ascribed unto the number of God's children, and made the heirs of life eternal;* and in the other, *that by the imposition of hands and prayer, they receive strength against sin, the world, and the devil.* Which grand omissions were designed to no other purpose, but by degrees to bring the Church of England into some conformity to the desired orders of Geneva. This I find noted in the preface of a book writ by William Reynolds, a virulent Papist, I confess, but one that may be credited in a matter of fact, which might so easily have been refuted by the book itself, if he had any way belied it."—*Hist. Presb.* 283.

[1] "This article" (the fifteenth) "was superadded by their procurement:" that of the Puritans. —*Ib.* 282.

[2] "Ultimus tamen articulus typis non fuit expressus, eo quod domina regina, ut dicitur, non assensit eidem." (Wilkins. iv. 285. *ex excerptis Heylinianis.*) Neal makes a sad case out of the article that recalled preaching licenses. (*Hist. Pur.* i. 302.) But it is clear that Puritanical preachers with a grain of moderation were pretty sure of new licenses under Archbishop Grindal.

[3] Canterbury, London, Winchester, Bath and Wells, Lichfield and Coventry, Gloucester, Lincoln, Chichester, Exeter, St. David's. (Margin, cited in the text, of Arch-

and ministers, inhibited from preaching for inconformity, appear to have been among the speakers brought forward in them. The latter class especially, could hardly fail of using them as a vent for the exasperation and bigotry natural to men in their situation. Fiery spirits, without any provocation of their own, become ungovernable under the stimulus of such examples. The *prophesyings*, accordingly, often found fervid interest for an auditory, in politics, personalities, and invectives against established religious usages. A princess, vigilant as Elizabeth, and jealous of her prerogative, was not likely to overlook these evils. Grindal considered them curable without any inroad upon the system itself. His anxiety to preserve this, induced him to prepare orders for subjecting the *exercises* to episcopal regulation. He forbade lay speaking, glancing "openly or covertly against any state, or any person public or private," invectives against existing ecclesiastical usages or discipline, and addresses from silenced ministers[1]. The queen, probably, thought

---

bishop Grindal's Letter to her Majesty, Dec. 20, 1576. STRYPE. *Grindal.* Append. II. n. 9, p. 568.) "I have seen letters of these bishops to Grindal, upon this subject." (COLLIER. ii. 555.) Heylin makes the archbishop prime mover in the *prophesyings.* "These meetings Grindal first connived at when he sate at York, under pretence of training up a preaching ministry for the northern parts. But afterwards he was so much possessed with the fancy of it that he drew many of the bishops in the province of Canterbury to allow them also." (*Hist. Presb.* 284.) We learn, however, from Dr. Thomas Jackson, a sufficient witness, that little, if anything, of this kind, could have been effected by Grindal in the northern province. The country was, in fact, too Popish and backward. "But since the Libertie of Prophesying was taken up, *which came but lately into the Northern Parts,* (unless it were in the towns of Newcastle and Barwick, where Knox, Mackbray, and Udal had sown their tares) all things have gone so cross and backward in our Church, that I cannot call the historie of these fortie years or more to mind, or express my observations upon it, but with a bleeding heart."—*Works.* ii. 273.

[1] Orders for reformation of

such a total prohibition of seasoning unlikely to receive much real attention, if old opportunities were continued. She followed advice, therefore, from others of the episcopal bench, and resolved upon suppressing the *prophesyings* altogether. The archbishop pleaded personally for their continuance, and left many things in their favour unsaid, merely for want of time[1]. She was inexorable, and shocked him by remarking, that even preachers were more numerous than was necessary, three or four in a county being amply sufficient[2]. This was, probably, a hasty sally, but Elizabeth's memory has been rather invidiously burthened with it. Men have long lived amid habitual preaching, and surrounded by a well-educated ministry that can command innumerable models for sermons. Public opinion, besides, generally secures the pulpit from intemperance. It is forgotten that Elizabeth grew-up under a Romish infrequency of preaching, and that many of her clergy still were dangerous instructors, from papal bias. A preacher could find but little to guide him in the study; nor was ability to use the appliances of learning by any means abundant. Among divines also, with Protestant views and sufficient competence, many were notoriously hostile to the national religious polity.

Grindal, having failed in his interview, strove to shake

---

abuses about the learned exercises and conferences among the ministers of the Church.—STRYPE. *Grindal.* 327.

[1] "It was not your Majesty's pleasure then, the time not serving thereto, to hear me at any length." (Archbishop Grindal to Her Majesty. *Ib.* 558.) In his ultimate submission, such as it was, Grindal admits that Elizabeth "therein did use the advice and allowance of certain bishops, his brethren."—*Ib.* 404.

[2] "How can it well be thought that three or four preachers may suffice for a shire?" (*Ib.* 561.) The archbishop's letter mentions before the queen's "speeches concerning the abridging the number of preachers." Neal cites a MS. i. 310.

the queen's determination by means of a long, rational, and pious letter[1]. He urges the inconsistency of referring legal questions to the law-officers, and of deciding that which peculiarly concerned himself and his brethren, without ever consulting them. Any instrumentality in suppressing the exercises he pronounces wholly irreconcilable with his conviction of duty. Hence he respectfully but firmly declines it. Elizabeth took nearly five months to consider this appeal, so worthy of a Christian minister. She then sent circulars to the several bishops enjoining an immediate discontinuance of the *prophesyings*[2]. The blow was final through the southern counties. Their obnoxious name was heard no more, though some of the prelates were very unwilling to suppress them[3]. Upon the policy of their extinction, posterity cannot easily judge, many weighty considerations presenting themselves on both sides of the question. But it is hardly possible to see any extenuation for the severity which Grindal's opposition provoked. Even if ill-judged, it was undoubtedly offered in the best spirit. It brought, however, the amiable and conscientious archbishop into the arbitrary court of Star-chamber, which imposed upon him sequestration from his functions, and confinement to his house, for six months[1]. The period expired without affecting his virtuous constancy, and subsequent severities kept him in disgrace and inactivity nearly to the end of life.

---

[1] Dec. 20, 1576. "He writes unto her a most tedious and voluminous letter." (HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 284.) "What could be written with more spirit and less animosity? more humility and less dejection? I see, a lamb in his own, can be a lion, in God and his church's cause." (FULLER. 130.) "He writes with the spirit of a primitive bishop. His application is religiously brave, and has not the least appearance of interest or fear."—COLLIER. ii. 557.

[2] The Queen to the Bishops throughout England. Greenwich, May 7, 1577. STRYPE. *Grindal.* Append. II. n. 9, p. 674.

[3] Neal has printed a letter from Thomas Bentham, bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, an exile at Basle under Mary, to one of his archdeacons, for discontinuing the *exercise*, until "earnest prayer, or humble petition," should restore the full use of it. The historian thus closes his account of the *prophesyings*. "The Queen put them down for no other reason but because they enlightened the people's minds in the Scripture, and encouraged their enquiries after truth; her Majesty being always of opinion that knowledge and learning in the laity would only endanger their peaceable submission to her absolute will and pleasure." (*Hist. Pur.* i. 315.) Other reasons, however, may easily be discerned for putting down *public* meetings which individuals had notoriously used for venting their own ill humours, and undermining the established church. Something like the *prophesyings* appear to have been used at archidiaconal visitations as a clerical exercise, in the diocese of York, under direction of Archbishop Sandys, in 1578.—STRYPE. *Grindal.* 444.

It is probable, that he was treated with such severity, partly with a view to intimidation. If, however, there were any such intention, the design wholly failed; a host of active and irreconcilable enemies daily menacing the hierarchy. One of the most inveterate among them, Anthony Gilby, a Lincolnshire man, educated at Christ's, in Cambridge, formerly an exile at Geneva, now ventured upon publishing his *View of Antichrist, his laws and ceremonies in our English Church unreformed.* This ebullition of fanatical violence was evidently written some years before, Parker being mentioned as the *pope of Lambeth.* A catalogue is given of *an hundred points of Popery remaining, which deform the English reformation*[2]. It is easy to see that nothing short of total subversion would satisfy such hot-headed enthusiasts. Gilby was, undoubtedly, among the most intemperate of his party[3].

---

[1] In June. (STRYPE. *Grindal.* 343.) "Grindal was a very honest, conscientious man, but too little of a courtier or statesman for the place he filled."—HALLAM. *Const. Hist.* i. 268. note.

[2] STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. pt. 2, page 216.

[3] "How fierce he was against the ceremonies, take it from his own pen. They are *known liveries of Antichrist, accursed leaven*

But he had long been regarded as a leader, and his outrageous invectives really spoke sentiments very widely prevalent. The interest excited by his libellous book seems to have tempted a young stationer into the hazard of vending *The Admonition to the Parliament*, which had lain for some time in concealment, and was passing from the recollection of ordinary people. Aylmer, the new bishop of London, however, took the alarm immediately, and the rash tradesman was committed to prison[1].

While the Presbyterians were labouring to impose their platform upon the country, an individual was acquiring influence which proved equally hostile to them and the church. Robert Browne, a near kinsman to Lord Burghley, was third son of Anthony Browne, a gentleman of ancient family, seated at Tolthorp, in Rutlandshire[2]. This Robert, educated at Corpus Christi college, Cambridge, was conspicuous through life for violence, conceit, and fickleness. He took his first impressions from the Puritans, but at length wholly disagreed with them, in desiring a further reformation of the establishment. He treated its character as unsusceptible of improvement, the whole system being a mere limb of Antichrist, that must be swept away. He even denied validity to ordination by the bishops, and maintained that England really possessed no church at all[3]. Though very young when he began to broach the principles that ended in these extravagances, he soon attracted sufficient attention for a summons to appear before the High Commission court. His family connections, probably, had recommended him as chaplain to the duke of Norfolk, and that nobleman

---

of the blasphemous Popish priesthood, cursed patches of Popery and idolatry, they are worse than lousy."—FULLER. 76.

[1] STRYPE. *Aylmer.* 37.

[2] STRYPE. *Whitgift.* i. 619. HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 295.

[3] *Ibid.*

would have excused his attendance, under plea of privilege. Archbishop Parker declining to admit this[1], Browne withdrew to Holland. Whether he had previously undergone any censure from the court, is unknown. During his residence abroad, he wrote a work, eagerly circulated in England, advocating the principles that eventually passed under his name[2]. He did not himself long shew any great regard for them but conformed to the church, and obtained a benefice, upon which he lived to a very advanced age. At last, he assaulted the constable of his parish in demanding a rate of him, and was committed to Northampton gaol, where he quickly died. He used to boast that he had been detained in thirty-two prisons, some so dark, that he could not see his hand at noon-day. Death in the thirty-third, under a charge of assault, throws a shade of suspicion over all his former committals. It makes him seem likely to have owed fame and trouble rather to a choleric, heady temperament, than to sound ability and the spirit of a martyr. His character, indeed, is very far from wearing a venerable aspect. Though he so far abandoned his principles as to hold the rectory of Achurch, in Northamptonshire, yet he never preached; preferring, seemingly, the name of mercenary to that of renegade. He quarrelled with his wife, and lived apart from her during many years[3].

---

[1] June 13, 1571. STRYPE. *Parker*. ii. 68.

[2] The book was printed at Middleburgh, in 1582.—HEYLIN. *ut supra*.

[3] FULLER. 168. The historian was born within a mile of Browne's parish, and remembered him. He says, "He was of an imperious nature, offended, if what he affirmed, were not instantly received as an oracle." Browne died in 1630. When brought before Sir Rowland St. John, a neighbouring magistrate, for the assault, he would not have been committed, had it not been for his own behaviour. "The Brownists did not differ from the church of England in any articles of faith, but were very rigid and narrow in points of discipline. They apprehended,

The principles, however, that he struck-out have secured him from oblivion. From him came the germ of Independency, which gradually superseded Presbyterian oligarchy, and has become the fruitful parent of modern nonconformity.

The queen's earlier years appear to have passed over without any particular inquiries into the ordination of actual ministers. Hence William Whittingham, pastor to the exiles at Geneva, had obtained, by Leicester's influence, even the valuable deanery of Durham, although his ministerial character was hardly reconcilable with any principles generally admitted. At length a metropolitical visitation of the northern province discovered numerous irregularities in his cathedral. As he disputed the archbishop's right to visit it, two royal commissions were successively issued, authorizing investigation[1]. The chief commissioner was the repulsed primate himself, Edwin Sandys, lately translated from London to York, who had entered upon his new duties by that laborious and costly tour of inspection, which gave rise to the proceedings. He had already questioned Whittingham's ordination, and he began the inquiry by desiring him to prove its validity. Matthew Hutton, dean of his own cathedral, afterwards bishop of Durham, and archbishop of York, successively, maintained that the dean of Durham had been ordained in better sort than Sandys himself, and indeed than most of the ministers in England[2]. But

---

according to Scripture, that every church ought to be confined within the limits of a single congregation, and that the government should be democratical." (NEAL. i. 330.) "The principles which Browne advocated were substantially the same which are now held by the majority of English dissenters."—PRICE. i. 315.

[1] The first commission was issued in 1576, the second in 1578. —STRYPE. *Annals.* pt. 2, pp. 168, 169.

[2] *Ib.* iii. 468.

the archbishop, though, like Whittingham, he had been an exile, and had entertained Puritanical views, was not to be chafed aside from an important question by the obloquy that it had brought upon him, or by vague, offensive generalities. He was even likely to account for the opposition, by Hutton's personal pique, being upon ill terms with him, and having charged him with an unseemly fondness for money[1]. The dean of Durham was, accordingly, in spite of a violent party outcry, put upon his defence. He confessed himself to be "neither deacon nor minister, according to the law of the realm[2]," but pleaded a sufficient ordination at Geneva. This, on the other side, was denied; most injuriously to the discredit, it was urged, of the orders given in a distinguished Protestant church[3]. Sandys would not allow Geneva to be any way compromised[4], Whittingham being treated as a *mere layman*[1], regularly ordained neither there nor anywhere else. The dean alleged a call to the ministry, "by lot and election of the whole English congregation there," and produced a certificate to that effect. Sandys excepted against the terms "lot and election," as conclusive in themselves, none such being used on these occasions in any reformed church. In the course of a month, Whittingham produced another certificate, which had *suffrages* in the place of *lot and election*, and which testified besides, that he "was admitted minister with such other ceremonies as there is used and accustomed[2]." A solemn adjudication of this case was precluded by the dean's death[3], but Archbishop Whitgift declared soon after, that he would have been deprived had he lived, without "especial grace and dispensation[4]." This is the first instance in which ordination was regularly made a moot point[5], and it is remarkable that Whittingham appears to have taken no notice of the act *For Ministers of the Church to be of sound Religion*[1]. Such silence in a contemporary under severe pressure, is very unfavourable to the construction commonly given to that statute by Dissenters. The legislature, in passing it, must have been known to have had Romish ordinations chiefly, if not entirely, in view; although it undoubtedly opened a door for connivance at such as were effected regularly by presbyters only, abroad. Whitgift, indeed, seems to deny validity to such ministerial commissions[2]. Sandys, perhaps, rather considered them irregular than invalid. Whittingham, however, had certainly no such commission to plead. He never speaks of himself as ordained by presbyters. He seems to have had merely what is termed, among Dissenters, *a call*, from the English refugees at Geneva, and to have been set apart for the ministry, by some of them, not in orders, in a private house[3]. Calvin might have approved the act, for Whittingham was one of his warmest admirers, but he was careful to keep it from being used as a precedent[4].

---

[1] Archbishop Sandys had been shocked, on first coming to York, to find money-lending, or usury, as it was called, very prevalent in that city. For its repression, he procured a commission from the crown and brought the offenders into his consistorial court. The dean defended the practice under inquiry as lawful, and endeavoured to alarm the witnesses by the prospect of a *præmunire.* He maintained himself personally nowise concerned. "Yet," subjoins the archbishop, "the report is, that his hands are deeply mired in this matter: for otherwise, he could hardly abound in such wealth, as he at this time presently doth."—The Archbishop of York to the Lord Treasurer. STRYPE. *Annals.* iii. 466.

[2] *Ib.* ii. pt. 2, page 170. From the State-Paper Office.

[3] "It could not but be ill taken of all the godly learned both at home, and in all the reformed churches abroad, that we should allow of the Popish massing priests in our ministry, and disallow of the ministers made in a reformed church." (The Earl of Huntingdon to the Lord Treasurer. *Ib.* 174.) Henry Hastings, earl of Huntingdon, then president of the north, a member of the commission, was favourable to Whittingham, as was also the dean of York, another member.

[4] "The discredit of the Church of Geneva is hotly alleged. Verily, my Lord, that Church is not touched. For he hath not received his ministry in that Church, or by any authority or order from that Church, so far as yet can appear."—The Archbishop of York to the Lord Treasurer, April 4, 1579. *Ib.* Append. XIII. p. 620.

---

[1] *Mere laicus.*—Huntingdon to Burghley. Strype. *Annals.* 173.

[2] State-Paper Office. *Ib.* 171, 172.

[3] June 10, 1579. He was preferred to this deanery, July 19, 1563. (Le Neve. 351.) "He was born in the city of Chester, 1524, and educated in Brazen-nose college, Oxon, but was afterwards translated to Christ-church, when it was founded by King Henry VIII. being reckoned one of the best scholars in the university. In the year 1550, he travelled into France, Germany, and Italy, and returned about the latter end of King Edward VI. In the reign of Queen Mary, he was with the exiles at Frankfort, and upon the division there, went with part of the congregation to Geneva, and became their minister. He had a great share in translating the Geneva Bible, and the Psalms in metre, as appears by the first letter of his name, W., over many of them. Upon his return home, he was preferrrd to the deanery of Durham, 1563, by the interest of the Earl of Leicester, where he spent the remainder of his life. He did good service, says the Oxford historian, against the Popish rebels in the north, and *in repelling the Archbishop of York from visiting the church of Durham;* but he was at best but a lukewarm conformist, an enemy to the habits, and a promoter of the Geneva doctrine and discipline. However, he was a truly pious and religious man, an excellent preacher, and an ornament to religion."—Neal. i. 318.

[4] Archbishop Whitgift's marginal animadversions upon Mr. Travers's Reasons, &c.—Strype. *Whitgift.* Append. B. 3. xxx. 185.

[5] Mr. Travers's Reasons, *ubi supra.*

Widely as Protestants and Romanists were apart upon many questions, they cordially agreed in considering the first four general councils as a final settlement of the questions debated in them. Both parties branded opinions condemned by these venerable assemblies, as unpardonable heresy. Whenever any such appeared, since the Reformation, it had, however, most unfairly to bear the whole discredit of them. The papal party sarcastically pointed to it as a headlong power, which had rashly let out waters, wholly above its management. Nay, more: the orthodoxy that it claimed, was painted as really questionable in every part[1]. To such irritating, but senseless reproaches, may reasonably be attributed those cruel vindications of common principles, which write occasionally the annals of early Protestantism in disgraceful characters of blood. One of these miserable instances occurred within the present year. Matthew Hammond, a plough-wright of Hetherset, near Norwich, was convicted of pronouncing the New Testament a fable, Christ a mere sinful man, erected into an abominable idol, the Holy Ghost a nonentity, and the sacraments useless[2]. On receiving sentence[3], he burst out into abusive language against the queen, and some of her council. The stern, proud spirit of the age could not overlook this natural ebullition of a fiery temper. He was farther condemned immediately to lose both his ears. After a month's interval[4], this part of the sentence was executed in the market-place: probably, with a view to his intimidation. But he repeated his denial of Christ's divinity. He was allowed another week, and then barbarously burnt in the ditch of Norwich castle[5]. The absurdity of thus murdering judicially an ignorant mechanic, almost equals its inhumanity.

---

[1] 13 Eliz. c. xii.

[2] Travers says, "VIII. The universal and perpetual practice of al Christendom, in al places, and in al ages, proveth the ministers lawfully made in any Church of sound profession in faith, ought to be acknowledged such in any other." Whitgift has in the margin, "Excepting always such Churches as allow of Presbytery and practise it."—STRYPE. *Whitgift.* 184.

[3] STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. pt. 2, page 168.

[4] This was asserted by Archbishop Sandys, and not denied by either the dean of York, or Archdeacon Ramsden.—State-Paper Office, *ubi supra.* 172

---

[1] "Id ego vero interim affirmo, non unum aut alterum, sed omnem istam Pseudo-martyrum colluviem ipsum Christianæ fidei fundamentum, quo fatemur Christum in carne venisse, aliaque Christianæ disciplinæ firmamenta inficiari." (*Dialogi. VI.* ab Alano Copo, Anglo. 878.) Alan Cope's wrath is chiefly excited by Foxe's martyrology, the sufferers commemorated in which he pronounces *Pseudo-martyrs*, and seeks to confound with Arians, or the like.

[2] Stowe. 685.

[3] April 14. *Ib.*

[4] May 13. *Ib.*

[5] May 20. *Ib.*

For another cruelty, which stains this year, Elizabeth may fairly be considered as personally responsible. Marriage offers facilities for achieving or augmenting greatness, that give heiresses a longevity of attraction hopeless to their sex in general. The queen, at forty-six, now dreamt of youth again, under liberal supplies of amorous admiration from a gay Frenchman, under thirty. Francis de Valois, long titled as duke of Alençon, afterwards as duke of Anjou, only surviving brother of Henry III., was eager to console impatience of real sovereignty, by a matrimonial throne. A dexterous agent, named Simier, urging his aspirations, with uncommon skill, was favourably, though perhaps evasively received. To quicken the lagging pace of diplomacy, *Monsieur*, as, according to usage, the young prince was called, came *incognito* to Greenwich, and had a private interview with the royal theme of his impassioned addresses[1]. Never was Elizabeth so nearly captured. In watching this unequal courtship, the nation became violently excited. It is true that she would hardly hear of tolerating Romanism even in Anjou himself, yet her subjects who professed it, naturally looked upon a marriage with him as a most auspicious turn in their affairs[2]. The tide of Puritanism set in strongly another way, and popular pulpits added acrimony to that hatred of the match which generally raged. Farther fuel was afforded by a pamphlet, which the Lord Mayor was promptly ordered to suppress by every practicable means[1], written, unfortunately for his own comfort, and the queen's memory, by Thomas Stubbe, formerly of Corpus Christi college, Cambridge, now a lawyer in Lincoln's Inn. He was about thirty-seven years of age[2], and a sister of his had married Cartwright, whose principles he cordially approved. His piece was quaintly entitled, *The Discoverie of a Gaping Gulf, wherein England is like to be swallowed by another French Marriage, if the Lord forbid not the banns by letting her see the sin and punishment thereof.* It used a coarse freedom, naturally offensive to vanity betrayed into circumstances rather ridiculous. Elizabeth was greeted, indeed, with warm protestations of loyalty and affection, but she was also reminded of her age with impenetrable coolness. Honest physicians would soon let her know the danger of bearing children at such a time of life. Undoubtedly, the risk was lessened by Anjou's own constitution, his whole family having been forced into the world by medical skill, and being unlikely, therefore, to perpetuate such violence to nature. It lay, besides, under the curse of heaven, and was, on that account, likely to be marked out for extinction. In the same blunt spirit was the queen's own taste arraigned. Her "carpet squire" was a mere "painted man," an ugly specimen of his unnatural race, that must quickly be dismissed, if she would but let her eyes do their office thoroughly. As for circumstances, he was a needy spendthrift, who would make a prey of England. As for morals, he and his brothers had the credit of emulating Heliogabalus, in his worst excesses, being thus rendered alike odious from debauchery, and loathsome from its consequences[1].

---

[1] CAMBDEN. 471.

[2] "Persons, the Jesuit, indeed, says in his famous libel, *Leicester's Commonwealth*, written not long after this time, that it" (the queen's marriage with Anjou) "would have been *honourable*, *convenient*, *profitable*, *and needful:* which every honest Englishman would interpret by the rule of contraries." (HALLAM. *Const. Hist.* i. 315. note.) "The strange papistes and our rebelles are in deepe silence, not one opens his mouth against this marriage."—*The Discoverie of a Gaping Gulf, &c.*

---

[1] An order of council for this purpose was despatched to him from Gidea Hall, near Romford, Sept. 27, 1579.

[2] He writes to a friend in 1581, of having spent "almost forty years of his vain life." (STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. pt. 2. page 305.) Another letter speaks of "mis-spent youth." (*Ib.* iii. 216.) Whether his early days had really been chargeable with irregularities, cannot, however, be certainly inferred. Persons of his religious opinions often use stronger language of self-abasement than their cases fairly warrant,

---

[1] The French "have sent us hither not Satan in the body of a serpent, but the old serpent in the shape of a man, whose sting is in his mouth, and who doth his endeavour to seduce our Eve, that shee and we may lose this Englishe Paradise." Of the French royal family Stubbe says, "Whose manifest cruelties and detected treacheries against God's church, have been severally sealed with his visible marks of vengeaunce, written, not upon the wall, but successively on theyr carcasses, with a heavenly fingar: not by torch light, but at noone day, in the eyes and eares of all the world." Of the reigning king, he says, "The plague common to the house he hath, that is, he wants one of his loins to sit upon his seate." Anjou's attendants are described as "these needie spent Frenchmen of Monsieur's traine, being of contrary religion, and who are the scomme of the king's court, which is the scomme of all Fraunce, which is the scomme of Europe, when they seeke, like horseleaches, by sucking upon us, to fill their beggarly purses to the satisfyeng of theyr bottomlesse expence." Anjou's own circumstances are thus treated: "This stinging stranger of Fraunce must we keepe warme in our bosom at our own intollerable charge. Even alreadie his debtes and expences are sayd to be farther at odds with his revenues then many yeres receipts can yeld the arerages." As to person, "I humbly beseech hir, that she will view it, and surview it, and in viewing it, she will fetch hir hart up to hir eyes, and carry hir eyes down to hir hart. And so I beseech God graunt hir at that time to have hir eyes in her heade, even in that sence in which Salomon placeth a wise man's eyes in his heade; and then I dout not but upon conference of hir wyse hart, and hir eyes togither, he shall have his dispatching aunswer." Of his family: "Though they speake in all languages of a merveilous licentious and dissolute youth, passed by this brotherhoode, and of as strange, incredible parts of intemperancie played by them, as those worst of Heliogabalus, yet will I not rest upon conjecturalls. Onely this I touch lightly, and cannot passe utterly in so high a matter, as is the marriage of my Queen, that it is worth enquiry after. For if but the fourth part of that misrule bruted should be true, it must draw such punishment from God, who for most part punisheth these vile sins of the body, even in the very body and bones of the offenders, besides other plagues to thyrd and fourth generation." As for issue, the French princes are pronounced unlikely to leave any; "all of them being a forced generation by phisick after many yeres, when theyr mother feared to be

Such gross personalities would generally make a party assailed by them, overlook any redeeming parts by which they might come accompanied. Stubbe was no vulgar libeller, and much of his production does him credit. But Elizabeth could naturally think only of insults to herself, and to the princely suitor, who soon afterwards came again to England. Her order of council to suppress the piece, before its author was discovered, speaks of it as having "not only very contemptuously intermeddled in matters of state, touching her Majesty's person, but also uttered certain things to the dishonour of the duke of Anjou." His arrival rendered some proceedings necessary. The writer, together with Page, who dispersed the pamphlet, and Singleton, who printed it, were quickly discovered. They were indicted under an act of Philip and Mary, *against the authors and publishers of seditious writings.* Lawyers doubted whether the statute had not expired, on the late queen's death. But conviction was

---

put away as barraine." The queen, too, should remember, as to children, that "her yeres doe necessarily denye her many," and render it unsafe to bear any. "If it may please hir Majestie to cal hir faythfulest wyse phisitians, and to adjure them by their conscience towards God, theyr loyalty to hir, and fayth to the whole land, to say theyr knowledge simply without respect of pleasing or displeasing any, and that they consider it also as the cause of a realm and of a prince, how exceedingly dangerous they find it by theyr learning, for hir Majestie at these yeres to have hir first child, yea, how fearfull the expectation of death is to mother and child, I feare to say what will be theyr aunswer." Hence people were no longer anxious for issue from the queen. "Dare we not now otherwise crave it, but so as might be from such a father as had a sound body and a holy soule, and yet not then neither, onles she may first find to stand with hir life and safety." So many, and such objections, naturally made Englishmen little partial to "this carpet conqueste of Monsieur," or willing to believe those, who would have "this paynted man to be a man," or to think it "possible to make something of this no friend, and to hold this wett eele by the tayle, as they say."—*The Discoverie of a Gaping Gulf, &c.* No place. *Mense Augusti, anno* 1579.

obtained, and the prisoners were sentenced to the barbarous penalty provided. Singleton was excused from this. Stubbe and Page underwent it, on a scaffold in Westminster. The former ascended evidently much intimidated. The prospect of losing his right hand in the prime of life hung heavily upon him, and he was not free from apprehension of a fatal hemorrhage. He spoke, however, long and well, inculcating obedience to the laws, and resignation to the will of Providence. Having finished his address, he knelt down in prayer. Then, rising, his hand was placed on the block, and a cleaver was driven by a mallet through the wrist[1]. As the crowd gazed in silent horror, the miserable sufferer, mustering every energy by a desperate effort, used his remaining hand to put his cap upon his head, and shouted *God save the queen*[2]. He then seems to have fainted[3]. His unfortunate companion, Page, was less daunted. He expressed sorrow for having offended the queen, but denied any evil intent. Holding up his doomed right hand, he feelingly mentioned its services in gaining him a living hitherto, and regretted, that his left, or even his life, had not been rather taken. He then bespoke the prayers of those around for his patient endurance of the punishment, and laying his hand on the block, begged the executioner to strike it off quickly. Such applications appear generally to render men nervous. In this case, the brutal mutilation was not completed without a second blow. The maimed victim then lifted up the stump, and said, "I have left there a true Englishman's hand." With the same steady courage, he departed from the scaffold[1]. Had it been reddened by his blood alone, the exhibition would have been deeply disgraceful to the government, but Stubbe's character and condition render it more offensive. That injured man was not, however, to be driven by resentment into any course unworthy of him. Hence Burghley had no hesitation in calling upon him afterwards to answer Allen's *English Justice:* a task which he did not decline[2]. He never ceased, however, to mark a lofty sense of the injustice perpetrated on him, by signing, *Thomas Stubbe, Sceva*[3].

---

[1] Cambden. 487.

[2] *Ib.* The historian was present. Stubbe says in his unfortunate pamphlet, "I humbly besech, that whatsoever offence any thing here sayd, may breed, it be with favor construed by the affection of my hart, which must love my country and Queene, though it shold cost me my lyfe."

[3] Sir John Harington, who gives his speech, says, "The haund redie on the block to be stricken off, he said often to the people, *Praye for me, nowe my calamitie is at hande.* And so with these wordes, yt was smitten of, whearof he sownded." (*Nugæ Antiquæ.* Lond. 1792. iii. 181.) This is only reconcileable with the account of the eye-witness, Cambden, by supposing it a circumstance that he has omitted.

Although his irritating pamphlet was only privately dispersed, it fell in so completely with public feeling, that its views were eagerly adopted. Zealous Protestants rose from its perusal, with an impression, half mournful, half angry, that Elizabeth was on the point of surrendering to French flattery, the religion of her country. To stay the progress of these anticipations, especially from the pulpit, a letter from the council to the prelacy, announced the queen's determination to maintain established religious principles, and mentioned *Monsieur's* connection with the Hugonot party at home; ridiculously adding that "he deserved to be honoured for the honour he did her Majesty in coming to see her." Another sentence properly admonished preachers to abstain from politics in their sermons, "as in truth not appertaining to their profession[1]." On receiving an earlier communication to the same effect, Aylmer, bishop of London, sent a hasty summons to the city clergy, and about forty of them attended him at his palace, to hear him reinforce the topics urged from court[2]. A like course was pursued in the diocese of Canterbury, and, most probably, elsewhere. Such precautions evidence a considerable ferment, and prove that when Stubbe was discovered, he was not needlessly dragged forth, a mere victim of wanton cruelty. To say nothing of offence given in France, he had clearly occasioned serious uneasiness to the government at home.

---

[1] Nov. 3, 1579.—*Nugæ Antiquæ*, iii. 182.

[2] Strype. *Ann.* ii. pt. 2. p. 306.

[3] This mode of spelling his name is his own. It is generally spelt *Stubbs*, as, no doubt, this hasty, but ill-used man was called; English names being commonly disfigured by the excrescence of an *s*. In two affecting pieces, printed in Harington's *Nugæ Antiquæ*, one an application to the queen, before he suffered, the other an application to the Council, for enlargement, afterwards, he writes himself *Stubbes*.

It was the more necessary to restrain a fresh supply of fuel for Puritanism, because its long-accumulated forces were quite unspent. A large party within the Church was unceasingly and actively bent upon her subversion, with a view of rearing *the holy discipline* upon her venerable foundations. As these men had imbibed a full conviction that the national system was unscriptural, and injurious to the progress of evangelical truth, a nice sense of honour must have driven them to the surrender of their professional appointments. To requite a supply of daily sustenance by reviling and undermining the institution from which it flows, can hardly consist with common honesty, much less with magnanimity. But many men, conspicuous for public violence, have a selfish instinct, ever armed with evasions and contrivances, for the protection of domestic comfort. Clerical incumbents, accordingly, though professed enemies of the institutions that gave them bread, clung to their benefices, notwithstanding, with no less tenacity than neighbours tender of the hand that fed them. They were not, indeed, willing to take part in the ministrations, denounced from their pulpits. The law that secured such for their parishioners, was to be discharged by deputy. Some humble curate was hired to read prayers, and administer sacraments. The well-endowed incumbent could not stoop to waste his powers, and tarnish his consistency, by any such grovelling regard for his obligations. He was above ordinances. His admiring hearers termed him *a Preacher, and no Sacrament-Minister*. His own assistant, and neighbours equally unpretending, were contemptuously known as *reading and ministering Ministers*[1]. Nor were such distinctions mere effusions of vulgar uncharitableness. We know of one preacher who inveighed in the pulpit against *Statute-Protestants, Injunction-men*, and *such as love to jump with the law*[2]. It is not likely that seasoning so accessible and savoury was monopolised by any single advocate of the *Seignory*. Nor can we doubt, that many who contended fiercely for the strictest clerical equality, were, notwithstanding, delighted with the popular elevation of themselves above the reprobated herd of *reading and ministering Ministers*. The growth of such an aristocracy was, however, highly distasteful to a government, really embarrassed by contending parties, and intent upon an uniformity now known to be unattainable. A letter, accordingly, from the privy council to the primate, enjoined inquiries after clergymen disjoining one part of their function from the other. Ecclesiastical censures were to compel, if possible, an union of ministering with preaching. Unyielding contumacy was to be dealt with by the council itself[1].

---

[1] Greenwich. Oct. 5, 1579.—STRYPE. *Grindal.* Append. 2, ixiii. p. 584.

[2] Sept. 27, 1579.—STRYPE. *Aylmer.* 41.

---

[1] The Privy Council to Archbishop Grindal. Jan. 17, 1580. STRYPE. *Grindal*. 363.

[2] Matters objected against Mr. Richard Rich, the elder. STRYPE. *Annals*. iii. 214.

The violence of Puritanical opposition to everything Romish rapidly undermined many ancient usages that bade fair for a long survival. Superstition fastened very early upon the eucharistic elements. In some instances, particular vineyards were reserved for sacramental wine, and none but the best was used. The first ages took sacramental bread from common loaves. Afterwards, the very meal was prepared with extraordinary care, and small round rolls made on purpose, called *oflets*, in Anglo-Saxon[2], each containing a handful, were alone allowed upon the altar. This continued beyond the middle of the eleventh century. Then, the wafer, the modern Romish *host*, came in fashion, greatly to the disgust of a ritualist of an older school, who has recorded this innovation of his own day, with a protest against such degeneracy[3]. The new usage, however, kept its ground. It was, in fact, peculiarly suited for a *mass*, at which ordinarily the priest alone receives: the cake being no bigger than a Roman *denarius*, which it was intended to resemble[1]. A similar cake, but larger and plain, was prescribed by King Edward's first service-book. The second allowed ordinary wheaten bread of the best quality procurable. The queen's *Injunctions*, fairly treating this rubric as merely permissive, ordered such wafers as had originally been made, under her brother[2]. The Puritans were highly offended, and commonly disobeyed; nor were legal authorities agreed in condemning them. Their opposition gradually banished wafers from our churches, but not completely before the Long Parliament[3].

---

[1] The Privy Council to Archbishop Grindal. Jan. 17, 1580. STRYPE. *Grindal.* 363.

[2] BONA. *De Rebus Liturgicis.* Par. 1672. pp. 218, 219, 220. *The Anglo-Saxon Church.* 242. note. 1st ed.; p. 233. 2nd ed.

[3] The *oflet*, called from its shape and use, *corona oblationis*, had a cross, with our Lord's name, on the top, and seems the original of our Good Friday bun. It appears to have been in use in 1054, when it is mentioned by Humbert, and about 1070, when it is named in a collection made by St. Udalric. Bernold, a priest of Constance, reprobates its disuse, about 1089. This ancient liturgist remains in MS. (BONA. *ut supra.*) The extracts from him that have appeared, render it probable that his whole work would not be acceptable to the Romish world.

Another remnant of the ancient system stood upon a more questionable ground. King Edward's first service-book gave some authority, tacitly withdrawn in the second, to prayers for the dead. At Northampton, down to the year 1569, persons were requested, by sound of bell carried before a corpse, to pray for the soul recently departed[1]. This usage must have prevailed elsewhere, and, probably, for some time afterwards. Another custom was without even the shadow of authority. At their churching, women wore a veil[2]. Puritanism did some service in blotting out all such vestiges of by-gone times. Had not their character been unsparingly assailed, Romish prejudice would have maintained its hold upon the public mind much more tenaciously than it eventually did. In one conspicuous observance, although of high antiquity, the government left really nothing for Puritanism to effect. Adherents to that system were very far from undervaluing fasting, but as usual, abhorred the stated fasts prescribed by Rome. This reprobation, aided by men's general impatience of restraint, seems to have driven the customary fish-days very much out of fashion. The change was naturally disagreeable to those who lived by fishing. Their interests, however, were duly regarded in an order of council, directed for circulation, to the primate, enjoining the customary attention to "Embring and fish-days[3]." But no Puritan had any occasion for alarm. Religious considerations were entirely disclaimed. People, it was declared, were not required to continue this form of fasting, "for any liking of Popish ceremonies, heretofore used (which are utterly detested), but only to maintain the mariners, and the navy of this land, by setting men a fishing[4]."

---

[1] Anciently the priests appear to have collected flour for making the sacramental bread, from house to house. When communicants fell short, individuals commuted this contribution for a *denarius*. The rolls actually made commemorated their connection with the *denarius*, by their circular form, figure, and inscription. The modern Romish *host*, which is unleavened, bears a figure of Christ on the cross, or bound to a column, or rising from the sepulchre.—Bona. 217.

[2] The wafers prescribed in King Edward's first service-book were to be unleavened. Queen Elizabeth's *Injunctions* of 1559 say nothing of this, but otherwise prescribe the same sort of wafer, which was popularly called a *singing cake*. As Edward's second book had parliamentary authority, which the queen's injunctions had not, the wheaten loaf might fairly be deemed more legal than the wafer. Sergeant Flowerdew, accordingly, charging a jury, in Norfolk, about 1574, pronounced statutable authority to be in favour of common bread. But such opinions were very distasteful at court.—Strype. *Parker*. ii. 343.

[3] Bishop Cosin, cited by Wheatly, says of the present rubric: "It is not here commanded, that no unleavened or wafer-bread be used; but it is only said, that the other bread *may suffice*. So that though there was no necessity, yet there was a liberty still reserved of using wafer-bread, which was used in divers churches of this kingdom, and Westminster for one, till the seventeenth of King Charles."—*Rational Illustr.* Oxf. 1819. p. 326.

---

[1] STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. 136. From the State-Paper Office.

[2] WHITGIFT'S *Defense.* 537.

[3] From Hampton Court, Dec. 13, 1576. STRYPE. *Grindal.* 338. WILKINS. iv. 288.

[4] "When secular men prescribe to the Church, when those who are strangers in antiquity, give laws for discipline, 'tis no wonder if they mistake in their direction. And to make the matter less surprising, three of those privy-councillors," (who signed the letter) "Leicester, Knowlis, and Walsingham, were either Puritans, or abettors of that party."—COLLIER. ii. 558.

Chapter V.

FROM THE ARRIVAL OF THE JESUITS TO THE SPANISH ARMADA.

1580—1588.

MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY—MAYNE—THE ENGLISH JESUITS—PAPAL QUALIFICATION OF THE DEPOSING BULL—PERSONS—CAMPION—THEIR ARRIVAL IN ENGLAND—TREASONABLE MISSION OF SANDERS TO IRELAND—PROCLAMATION AGAINST JESUITS AND SEMINARISTS—ACT AGAINST THEM AND THEIR RECONCILEMENTS—DISGUST OF ROMISH CLERGYMEN WHO HAD NOT EMIGRATED—CAMPION'S TEN REASONS—HE IS TORTURED—DISPUTES—TRIED AND EXECUTED—CONTROVERSY UPON ENGLISH PERSECUTION—SOMERVILLE—CARTER, THE PRINTER—THROCKMORTON—CREIGHTON—FARTHER LEGISLATION AGAINST JESUITS AND SEMINARISTS—PARRY—PETITION IN FAVOUR OF THE RECONCILING ECCLESIASTICS—MANY OF THEM SENT ABROAD—SAVAGE—BALLARD—BABINGTON—EXECUTION OF THE CONSPIRATORS—DECAPITATION OF MARY, QUEEN OF SCOTS—TREACHERY OF YORK AND STANLEY—BURNINGS FOR HERESY—THE SPANISH ARMADA.

A reign of more than twenty years had now firmly seated Elizabeth in the hearts of her people generally. Of late, great pains have been taken to lower her character. She has been mercilessly taxed for personal weaknesses, female malignity, and arbitrary government. Some who seek for heroines, have found one in Mary of Scotland, who is an interesting beauty, cruelly oppressed by a powerful and unfeeling rival, envious of real charms. Religious and political prepossessions make others brand a sovereign, still popularly styled *good queen Bess*, as a persecutor and a despot. Contemporaries, however, treat Mary with a business-like insensibility to the romantic. Jealousy of her beauty appears, indeed, to have been so little suspected, that one might be excused in supposing the plainest of her varying portraits to be most like the original. Were it otherwise, the majority of Englishmen could only think of the danger that she brought upon their country. They made no doubt of her privity to Darnley's murder: they could make none of her levity and laxity. Hence they considered her death a sacrifice to public expediency, which gross want of principle would abundantly excuse. Their opponents laboured anxiously to place her on the throne. They wanted a tool for their own selfish ends, and none was ever likely to be found half so serviceable. With much of Elizabeth's policy, modern views are wholly and justly irreconcileable. But her own day was prepared for no such disapproval. She governed with a high hand, undoubtedly. So had all the ablest of her predecessors. Such rule was, therefore, merely taken as evidence of superior capacity. As for severity, whether to Papist, or Puritan, all knew, that either, if in power, would use as much, or more, to the other, and to the Church party besides. Then, national prosperity had largely and steadily advanced, ever since the queen's accession. Her own manners, too, in spite of haughtiness at bottom, were highly popular. Hence most men reckoned with unmingled satisfaction upon that lengthened reign, which the common course of nature fairly promised. Since the northern rebellion, this calculation seemed little likely to be foiled by violence, the common bane of princes. But Elizabeth now reached a period of unceasing danger. The Romish party, thoroughly convinced of her ability, had grown hopeless of ascendancy, while she lived. Its more unprincipled members began, accordingly, to think of regicide. Thus an uncertainty hung over the queen's life, which must have seriously embittered it, and to which she feelingly alludes in one of her speeches to Parliament[1]. With such uneasiness the thriving and peaceful Protestant cordially sympathised. He saw a sovereign, really loved, menaced with assassination, and he naturally exaggerated her peril. He became also exasperated by apprehension of a blow, injurious to national prosperity, and the Reformation.

The depressed party that irritated and alarmed him, had really no spare credit, when its movements earned new unpopularity. The Marian fires had glared upon the eyes of all, even middle-aged. Mere boys could remember the northern rebellion, and every Englishman yet spoke, either with regret or indignation, of the delirious and infamous bull which stamps indelible disgrace upon the name of Pius. Yet worse, were foreign examples most under observation. Alva's tyranny, the scourge of Flanders, drove multitudes of homeless Protestants to paint his cruelties in England. By an atrocity still greater, the festival of St. Bartholomew was rendered for ever odious in Paris[2]. There a wretched king, by secret orders, had betrayed to wholesale murder the very lives that sovereigns are maintained in splendour for protecting. This worse than Neronian tool of perfidious bigotry, who treacherously turned a nuptial banquet-hall into a charnel-house, was, indeed, barely twenty-three. Some allowance may be, therefore, fairly claimed for youth, and inexperience, and slender understanding, and ignorance, the wall that interest keeps up round a throne. But who will ask allowance for those mature advisers, or tempters rather, that pushed the royal puppet upon the horrors of St. Bartholomew? Who, for the pope, that was betrayed into savage, senseless exultation by this inextinguishable infamy of Rome? The stern, gloomy Pius, had gone to his awful reckoning. Gregory XIII., now occupant of his chair, figured in a procession, termed religious, which profaned God's house with antichristian thanksgivings for this enormous crime. Nor did even this content him. He published a jubilee, and struck

---

[1] "As way-faring pilgrims, we must suppose, that God would never have made us but for a better place, and of more comfort than we find here. I know no creature that breatheth, whose life standeth hourly in more peril for it than mine own, who entred not into my state without sight of manifold dangers of life and crown, as one that had the greatest and mightiest to wrestle with. Then it followeth that I regarded it so much, as I left my life behind my care."—D'Ewes. 328.

[2] 1572. "Despatches, dated the 24th of August, were sent to all the superior authorities in the kingdom. In these, the King attributes the recent massacre at Paris to the ancient quarrel between the house of Guise and the admiral." (*Vindication of certain passages in the fourth and fifth volumes of the History of England*, by J. Lingard, D.D. Lond. 1826. p. 33.) Dr. Lingard, however, does not exculpate Charles, but freely admits him responsible for the carnage. He only contends that his consent was given late and reluctantly, and that it did not extend to the provincial massacres, these being mere ebullitions of popular rage provoked by former excesses of the Hugonots. Charles

was, indeed, himself obliged quickly to avow his authority, the duke of Guise having positively contradicted the imputation cast upon him. The miserable young monarch was then driven to the necessity of saying that his infamous order had been extorted from him in self-defence, Coligni and his friends having traitorous designs on foot against himself and others of the royal family. Dr. Lingard fairly represents the kingly culprit's contradictory statements as evidence against a plot of some years' standing. For this, however, contemporary Romish writers have left authority. Some of them were so delighted by such extensive slaughter of their adversaries, that they repelled indignantly all attempts to give it an accidental character. They would hear of nothing but the triumph of a policy equally refined and admirable. When the papal archives were at Paris, Chateaubriand consulted them upon this very question, and became satisfied, that the massacre came from no long premeditation, but was a sudden consequence of the admiral's wound, and that its victims were less numerous than authors generally represent. (*Ib.* 56. 62. 70.) Still, the king's conduct wears a very suspicious appearance, and such as think him to have incurred the guilt of perfidy, in addition to that of cruelty, have a strong case within reach.—See Smedley's *Reformed Religion in France.* i. 360.

blaspheming medals in besotted witness to exultation so revolting[1]. Such was the main-spring of that tortuous policy which eventually menaced Elizabeth with assassination, and made her loyal subjects tremble for those advantages that an administration, wiser far than common, was daily showering through their country.

England received intelligence of the Bartholomew carnage not only with disgust and indignation, but also with deepest alarm: Archbishop Parker, especially, became filled with apprehension, and thought domestic Romanism treated with dangerous lenity[2]. To leading men, generally, the papal system now seemed unfathomably cruel and perfidious. Hence Romanists in custody were more strictly kept, some out on bail were incarcerated, as were many hitherto altogether at large[3]. The queen, however, would not abandon her judicious principle of applying direct force to the conscience of no man[1]. She constantly refused, indeed, permission for the open profession of any other than the national religion. She seemed sometimes little inclined even to connive at the secret performance of Romish rites. Englishmen attended mass, in the houses of foreign ambassadors, with a degree of clandestinity[2]. In their own residences, it had been liable to interruption by the officers of justice from the very beginning of this reign. Persecution of a graver cast is not chargeable upon Elizabeth's first nineteen years. It is true that numerous executions followed the northern rebellion. But no government is blameable for punishing capitally those who rise in arms against it. Sanders, indeed, makes *martyrs* of the unhappy persons who perished by legal sentence upon this occasion. The bulk of men, however favourable to their opinions, will allow them to have been *rebels*. Nor can the duke of Norfolk's death be connected with religious persecution. That very weak but ambitious peer, pupil of Foxe, the martyrologist, lived and died a Protestant. Unquestionably, his cause was

---

[1] "Immediately upon the receipt of the news, the pontiff proceeded with solemn supplication from St. Mark's to St. Louis's temple; and having published a jubilee for the Christian world, he called upon the people to commend the religion and King of France to to the supreme Deity. He gave orders for a painting descriptive of the slaughter of the admiral and his companions to be made in the Hall of the Vatican by Giorgio Vasari, as a monument of vindicated religion, and a trophy of exterminated heresy, solicitous to impress by that means how salutary would be the effect to the sick body of the kingdom of so copious an emission of bad blood. He sends Cardinal Ursino as his legate *a latere* into France, to admonish the King to pursue his advantages with vigour, nor lose his labour, so prosperously commenced with sharp remedies, by mingling with them more gentle ones. But that the slaughter was not executed without the help of God and the divine counsel, Gregory inculcated in a medal struck on the occasion, in which an angel, armed with a sword and a cross, attacks the rebels." (Translation from BONANI. *Life of St. Pius the Fifth.* 213.) Mr. Mendham has engraven representations of these medallic testimonies to the blind cruelty of Rome. A French translation of the bull of jubilee is in the Appendix to STRYPE'S *Parker.* (LXVIII. iii. 197.) It hypocritically speaks of Charles IX. as excited by God to avenge the Hugonot injuries and outrages.

[2] STRYPE. *Parker.* ii. 120.

[3] These precautions were consequent upon a letter from the council, in September, to the High Commission Court. English Ro-

---

manists generally appear to have spoken with horror and detestation of the Paris massacre. A few exulted.—STRYPE. *Parker.* ii. 122.

[1] One of her principles was, "That consciences are not to be forced, but to be won and reduced, by the force of truth, with the aid of time, and the use of all good means of instruction and persuasion."—Sir Francis Walsingham to M. Critoy. *Cabala.* Lond. 1691. p. 372.

[2] "I pray you, doe but goe upon the Tamis, and see what companies goe to the french mas, enquire what numbers flocked in at backfield gates to the portugale mas, how the spanish massers had their customers more then enough." (STUBBE's *Gaping Gulf.*) Individuals, not of the family, were sometimes taken into custody for attending mass in these foreign houses, a watch being set upon them, or even the houses themselves entered.—*Queen Elizabeth and her Times.* i. 123. 467.

that of Romanism, but his instrument was treason, and he is known to have been justly punished[1].

---

[1] Beheaded on Tower Hill, June 2, 1572. "Tho' he conformed under Queen Elizabeth, yet he was always look'd upon to be a private abettor of the Catholic interest." (DODD. ii. 35.) This historian ridiculously represents the marriage with Mary to have been "fraudulently projected by the English ministry as an effectual means to ruin the Duke." (*Ib.* 36.) "He own'd himself a member of the Church of England at his trial, which some think was a piece of management to dispose the Queen for mercy. However it does not appear that he made profession of any other faith, when he came to die." (*Ib.* 37.) He was attended on the scaffold by Alexander Nowell, dean of St. Paul's, and however displeasing the fact may be to Romanists, he discovered no leaning towards their opinions. Had he succeeded in marrying Mary, he probably would have shewn himself far more swayed by a selfish ambition, than by sound religious principle, and suffered any issue of his marriage to be educated in a faith, that he had not the face, and hardly the heart, to profess himself. In his dying letter to his children, he says, "Upon my blessing, beware of blinde Papistry, which brings nothing but bondage to men's consciences. Mix your prayers with fasting, not thinking thereby to merit, for there is nothing that we of ourselves can do that is good; we are but unprofitable servants; but fast, I say, thereby to tame the wicked affections of the mynde, and trust only to be saved by Christ's precious bloud, for without your perfect faith therein there is no salvation. Let workes follow your faith, thereby to shewe to the world that you do not onely saye you have faith, but that you give testimony thereof to the full satisfaction of the godly. I write somewhat the more herein, because perchance, you have heretofore heard, or perchance hereafter shall heare false brutes that I was a Papist. But trust unto it, I never, since I knew what religion meant, I thanke God, was of other mynde then now you shall heare that I dye in, although I cry God mercy, I have not given fruites and testimony of my faith, as I ha' ought to have done, the which is the thinge that I do now chieflyest repent." (*Queen Elizabeth and her Times.* i. 406.) This language is exactly such as might be expected from an education under Foxe, and to his old tutor the duke left an annuity of 20*l.* It is, however, obvious, that he even himself expected to be claimed by contemporary Romanists, and such appears to have been fact, but Watson denies it any foundation, and the letter cited above is evidence that he was right.

In the Hardwicke Papers, are five letters from Mary of Scotland to Norfolk, fairly styled by the editor, "political love-letters from a very artful woman to a very weak man." In one of these (Jan. 31, 1570,) she says, "You have promised to be myne, and I yours." In another, (March 19, 1570,) "If you mind not to shrink at the matter, I will live and die

By these examples, it was hoped, ill humours were

with you. Your fortune shall be mine, therefore, let me know, in all things, your mind." In a third, from Wingfield, (the 24th of some unnamed month, in 1570,) she coaxingly says, "Now, my Norfolk, you bid me command you: that would be besides my duty, many ways." (*Miscellaneous State Papers from* 1501, *to* 1726. Lond. 1778. pp. 190, 191, 194.)

In the year 1571, an execution took place, which should be mentioned in this work, since the victim is chronicled by Sanders, as an illustrious martyr, although even politics may not really have caused his miserable death. John Story, once principal of Broadgates' Hall, now merged in Pembroke College, Oxford, became a civilian in the reign of Henry VIII. married, and was made chancellor of the diocese of London. Romanists represent his choice of a lay profession to have come from the distrust and dissatisfaction with which he viewed existing affairs in the Church. Protestants afford another reason, by detailing acts of notorious irregularity and violence, at Oxford; with a minuteness too, which hardly allows them to seem wholly false. On Edward's accession, Story, then member of Parliament, speaking against the Common Prayer, cited the text, *Woe to the realm, whose king is a child.* Privilege would not then cover such liberties, and the speaker was committed. When released, he retired into Flanders, and did not return until Mary's accession. He then acted as commissioner in prosecutions for heresy, and became extremely hateful to the Protestants. Being again in Parliament, when Elizabeth came to the throne, he retained all his old violence, expressing himself sorry for having lately "chopped at twigs, instead of the root." This was taken as evidence of regret for attacking the poor, and sparing the queen, when she might have been in his power. Story was, accordingly, committed once more. Escaping, after some years, (it is said) he seems to have applied successfully for the royal permission to emigrate, and went back into Flanders; where his knowledge of civil law recommended him as an assistant searcher for contraband merchandise, the duke of Alva having then prohibited commercial intercourse with England. He thus became an instrument for confiscating the properties of his countrymen, and naturally reaped new odium among them. In the course of his vocation, he was informed of an English ship, arrived off Zealand, full of prohibited goods. He went on board, and the captain steered for England. He was landed at Harwich, in August, 1570. Information of this being sent to London, the council appear to have been in doubt as to the best course of proceeding with him. Being brought up from Harwich, he was first confined in the house of Archdeacon Watts, by St. Paul's, afterwards in Lollards' Tower, (an appendage to the cathedral,) as if he were to be charged with some canonical offence. Subsequently he was committed to the Tower, and on the 26th of May, 1571, he was largely purged away[1]. Their farther correction was left contentedly to time. The operation of this effectual sedative was interrupted when Don John of Austria, natural son to Charles V., became governor of the Netherlands[2]. Immediately did fancy haunt him with be-

---

tried before the court of Queen's Bench, in Westminster Hall, as an accomplice in the northern rebellion. In bar of proceedings, he pleaded a transfer of his allegiance to the crown of Spain, but this being overruled, he was convicted and sentenced. On the first of June, he was executed at Tyburn, being then sixty-seven years old. He made a long address to the crowd, generally conceived in a grave and becoming spirit. This denied any treasonable correspondence with the Nevilles and Nortons, but admitted the writing of an instrument with his own hand, to answer a similar purpose in Scotland, Elizabeth and her dominions being especially exempted from its operation. He laboured to clear himself from the charge of cruelty under Queen Mary, but his apology goes little farther than shewing him alive to the impolicy of burning any more in London. "I saw that it would not prevail, and therefore, we sent them into odd corners of the country." In the savage spirit that was allowed to vent itself, when sufferers for treason were highly odious to the populace, he was cut down quickly, but Sanders and Bridgewater do not say that he seemed sensible, or made any noise. The contemporary account of his death, by an unfriendly, but seemingly veracious Protestant, merely says that "he was hanged according to his judgement." Subsequently, Dr. Fulk, describing his quartering in a most brutal tone, says that he "roared" violently, required three or four men to keep him down, and even struck the executioner. With this very executioner, the writer himself seems to have talked, but perhaps, at such a distance of time as might encourage exaggeration. Story had become so obnoxious both from his instrumentality in the Marian persecution, and in Alva's confiscations, that a fierce, vindictive age could never hear enough of his dying agonies. Whatever these might be, he owed them, probably, rather to commercial, than to religious, or political resentment.—BRIDGEWATER. 43. A Declaration of the Lyfe and Death of John Scory. 1571. *Harleian Miscellany*. iii. 99. STRYPE. *Annals*. ii. 124.

[1] "Because the ill humours of the Realm were by that rebellion partly purged, and that she feared at that time no foreign invasion, and much less the attempt of any within the Realm, not backed by some potent succour from without, she contented herself to make a law against the special case of bringing or publishing of any bulls, or the like instruments."—Sir F. Walsingham to M. Critoy. *Cabala*. 372.

[2] 1576. "He had resolved to deliver and marry the Scots

witching visions of a matrimonial throne. Why not use his opportunities to overthrow Elizabeth and marry Mary? Upon such selfish projects, a new conspiracy arose. Romish priests might sap and mine to gain over discontented Englishmen. From those who had remained at home, such unpatriotic services were not, however, to be expected. Hence the *Seminaries* came into requisition. Their first conspicuous importation was a young Devonshire man, named Cuthbert Mayne. A clerical uncle had sent him to St. John's college, Oxford, and he took his master's degree in that university. Having received priest's orders in the established church, he imbibed a partiality for Popery, and withdrew to Douay. Clergymen transported into the Puritanical extreme, sometimes renounced their orders. Mayne set an example of this kind to the other extreme party, now joined by himself[1]. He underwent re-ordination, and passing over into England soon afterwards, became chaplain to a wealthy Cornish gentleman, named Tregian. It proved a most

---

Queene, and in his conceit had devoured the kingdomes of England and Scotland, by the persuasion of the Earle of Westmoreland, and other fugitives, and by favour and countenance of the Pope and the Guises." (BISHOP CARLETON'S *Thankful Remembrance.* 31.) The prince of Orange apprised Elizabeth of Don John's plot. He seemed mad for sovereignty, having before intended to become king of Tunis. (CAMBDEN. 476.) His plot seems to have decided Elizabeth to support the Belgians. (TURNER'S *Elizabeth.* iv. 339. note.) Don John died rather suddenly in camp before Namur, Oct. 1, 1578.

[1] Mayne was born near Barnstaple. He took the degree of M.A. April 8, 1570, he arrived at Douay in 1570, and was re-ordained in 1575. (DODD. ii. 92.) He returned to England at Easter, 1576. (BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* iii. 386.) Archbishop Bancroft supplies a similar case of re-ordination among the Puritans. "Master Snape, being a minister already, renounced that his first calling; was called by the *Classis;* by that calling he preached, but would not administer the Lord's Supper. After the parish of St. Peter's, knowing that he must not account himself a full minister untill some particular congregation had chosen him, they chose him for their minister. Thus farre Hawgar."—*Dangerous Positions.* 115.

unhappy connection to both parties. Tregian, then a young man of twenty-eight, was molested for recusancy, and probably, suspected of some political offence. His lengthened and severe sufferings are otherwise unintelligible[1]. Mayne being convicted, under the act of 1571, against bringing in bulls, or *Agnus Deis*, and reconciling to Rome, was executed at Launceston[2]. His was the first conviction, and he passes for "the proto-martyr of Douay college[1]." He seems really to have had valuable qualities, and was, most likely, very far from an offensive politician. But his errand had a dangerous affinity with treason, and those who sent him upon it were bitter enemies to the peace of England. Romish ministrations are very liable to be misunderstood by Protestants. Habitual confession gives opportunities of infusing principles entirely beyond the reach of any church that does not habitually tamper with conscience. After the bull of Pius, papal doctrines, under Elizabeth, even with respectable expositors, had a strong leaning towards revolutionary politics. Mayne lies under an imputation of inculcating reprehensible and dangerous doctrine, that made him no safe confessor. Nelson and Hance, executed at Tyburn, subsequently, appear to have been confessors of the same stamp[2]. There is no reason for

---

[1] A long and interesting account of them from a MS. written in 1593, and before printed by Dodd, may be seen in Butler. (*Hist. Mem.* iii. 382.) A few additional particulars from some hostile or impartial contemporary would, probably, rather lighten the odium that this narrative throws upon the government. Undoubtedly, Mr. Tregian was very hardly used, but the wanton exercise of power was not in keeping with Elizabeth's ordinary policy. His house was entered by the officers of justice, when Mayne was apprehended, in quest of a fugitive from London, against whom warrants were out. —BRIDGEWATER. 50.

[2] Nov. 29, 1577. Committed June 8. (BUTLER. iii. 384.) "There was no man, in six years' time, proceeded against upon that law, tho' some were apprehended who had offended against it. The first that was convicted by this law was Cuthbert Maine, a priest, who being an obstinate maintainer of the Pope's power against his prince, was put to death, at St. Stephen's fane, commonly called Launston, in Cornwal." (CAMBD. 459.) "Hanse, Nelson, and Maine, priests, and Sherwood, peremptorily taught the queen was a schismatic and a heretic, and therefore to be deposed: *for which they were put to death.* Out of these Seminaries were sent forth into divers parts of England and Ireland, at first a few young men, and afterwards more, according as they grew up, who were entered over hastily into holy orders, and instructed in the above-mentioned principles. They pretended only to administer the sacraments of the Romish religion, and to preach to Papists. But the queen and her council soon found that they were sent underhand to seduce the subjects from their allegiance, and obedience due to their prince, to oblige them by reconciliation to perform the Pope's commands, to stir up intestine rebellions under the seal of confession, and indeed, to execute the sentence of Pius V. against the Queen, to the end that way might be made for the Pope and the Spaniard, who had of late designed the conquest of England." (*Ib.* 476.) Allen lays Mayne's conviction upon the finding in his bed-chamber of a bull for a gone-by jubilee, a fact aggravated, he says, improperly by Manwood, the judge who tried him. "Cum exemplar quoddam, non ita longe abhinc, inventum esset illius bullæ quæ Jubilæum annum præterritum indixerat, etsi nihil ad Anglos pertinebat, etsi alieno in regno impressum esset, etsi elapso jam tem-

---

pore vigorem amisisset, etsi despectum in laceris solum chartulis jaceret, tamen rei atrocitas severitate judicis tam vehementer est aucta, ut Sacerdos cujus in cubiculo reperta fuerat, morti acerbissimæ ob eam causam sit traditus." (*De Persecutione Anglicana.* Rom. 1582. p. 64.) Mr. Hallam makes short work of Mayne's case, declaring him to have been "hanged at Launceston, without any charge against him except his religion." (*Const. Hist.* i. 197.) His apprehension was accidental. Tregian having roughly received the officers on their search, they proceeded to ransack the house. Mayne's bedroom door was locked, but a violent knocking caused him to open it. "Who are you?" he was asked. "A man:" he replied. He was then seized, and his vest being forced open, an *Agnus Dei* appeared hanging from his neck. Hence farther inquiry.—BRIDGEWATER. 51.

[1] DODD. ii. 93.

[2] John Nelson was executed, Feb. 3, 1578, "for denying the Queenes supremacie, and such other traiterous words against her Majestie." (STOWE. 684.) Everard Hance, a seminary priest, was tried at the Old Bailey, July 18, 1581, "where he affirmed that himselfe was subject to the Pope in ecclesiasticall causes, and that the Pope hath now the same authoritie here in England that he had an hundred yeeres past, with other trayterous speeches." (*Ib.* 694.) He was executed July 31. Allen says, that he was charged with teaching

casting moral imputations upon any one of these unfortunate clergymen, but there is as little for charging a menaced and embarrassed government with wanton persecution. All the sufferers might rather want sound sense, than honesty, although it is most improbable that political ascendancy, and consequent promotion, were overlooked by any one of them. But governors cannot allow impunity to those, however well-meaning, who serve more designing heads in projects involving bloodshed and con-

---

that no treason against the Queen of England was sin, his real doctrine being, as he repeatedly asserted, and up to the moment of his death, *that no such treason as he died for was sin.* (*De Persec. Angl.* 30.) There is no doubt, however, that he, like the two unfortunate priests, who were sacrificed before him, and the numerous victims in after years, might have saved his life by an explicit renunciation of the Pope's deposing power. A government pressed with serious difficulties, thought clergymen reasonably suspected of holding that doctrine, and certainly refusing to disclaim it, peculiarly unfit to tamper in confession with the consciences of a discontented party. Few will doubt this unfitness, however men may differ as to the remedy adopted.

Hance, though the third clerical victim, was the fourth Romanist who suffered. Thomas Sherwood, a young layman, was executed as a traitor, at Tyburn, Feb. 7, 1578. Stowe says that it was "for the like treason" with that of Nelson. He frequented the house of a Romish lady, whose son, a staunch Protestant, often argued with him, and suspected him of contriving to have mass said in his mother's apartments. This young gentleman, one day, met him in the streets of London, and called out *A Traitor!* A crowd collected, and Sherwood was taken into custody. He seems, as usual, to have been treated with shameful cruelty in the Tower, for the purpose of extorting the names of those in whose houses he had heard mass. His committal to that fortress followed upon an admission made while under an argumentative examination, that he considered the Pope entitled to an ecclesiastical supremacy over England. (*De Pers. Angl.* 41.) The real truth seems to be, that this young man was a known agent for bringing priests and wealthy recusants together, and that he had absconded on some discovery. If his former habits had continued, there was no occasion for the old lady's son, however *full of Calvin*, and *furiously-minded*, ("Calvino plenus, furebat animo,") to raise a crowd in the street for his apprehension. Nor is it likely, that the government would have acted as it did, if Sherwood had been merely a young man heated with Romish fanaticism.

fusion. The punishment inflicted was, undoubtedly, of needless and revolting severity. For this the age must be blamed. Ordinary felonies were visited with a sanguinary vengeance from which after times gradually receded, and which our own generation has happily abandoned altogether[1]. It may be pleaded in extenuation, that gross manners require sharp remedies, and that ancient frugality admitted not of modern prisons, or *police*. Political offences had also a danger unknown to later years, from the want of standing armies. The sovereign was nearly defenceless against a sudden emergency. What now could prove, at worst, a temporary shock, soon repaired, might anciently have overset a government. The law of treason, too, had a latitude which seems absurd. Coiners, forgers, and rioters, were brought under its merciless lash, as well as papal emissaries[2].

---

[1] Dec. 6, 1583, ten horse-stealers were hanged at once in the horse-market, in Smithfield. (STOWE. 697.) Even middle-aged persons have heard from witnesses, of three or four carts going at one time to Tyburn, with miserable criminals for execution. Such severity gradually diminished during the whole reign of George III., but capital punishments did not reach their present infrequency, until quite lately, under William IV. Anciently, they were numerous to a frightful and revolting extent. Elizabeth's age, therefore, only dealt with holders of the Pope's deposing power, in the same barbarous spirit that visited ordinary crimes. In a letter to Burghley, first Sunday after Michaelmas, 1577, Fleetwood, recorder of London, says that eighteen were executed at the last sessions, and one was pressed to death. There was "neither favour nor partialitie," and no one was reprieved.—*Queen Elizabeth and her Times*. ii. 69.

[2] When Felton was arraigned for fixing the Pope's deposing bull on the gate of London House, two young men were arraigned with him, for coining, and clipping the coin. All were found guilty of high treason. After he was executed before the bishop's, the sheriffs returned to Newgate for the coiners, whom they took to Tyburn, where they were hanged and dismembered, as their fellow-convict had been elsewhere. Some years afterwards, a clergyman and bachelor of arts, produced a forged presentation to a crown living at Hastings. Being convicted of this offence, he was hanged, bowelled, and quartered, at Tyburn. At another time, the same fate over-

The severities to which Elizabeth was driven, after a forbearance of nineteen years, would, probably, have overcome the hinderance to her plan of extinguishing English Romanism gradually, had not a new class of agents interfered. The secular clergy, as Romanists term ordinary ministers of religion, are liable to important modifications of opinion, from long intercourse with indiscriminate society, and imperfect connection with each other. The regulars, or monastic bodies, may be permanently trammelled. Nurtured in the very system

took a scrivener in Holborn, who had counterfeited a patent, affixing to it the seal from an old one. In the same year, five youths, who had been concerned in some riotous amusements upon Tower Hill, were convicted of high treason, and executed as usual, upon the scene of their offence. (STOWE. 666. 719. 769.) Edward the Third's Statute of Treasons expressly applies to the counterfeiting of the king's great or privy seal, or his money. The coiners, therefore, and, perhaps, the scrivener, were undoubtedly guilty of high treason, as the law stood. Of the clerical forger much the same may be said, and lawyers had no difficulty in fixing equal liability on the poor lads who fell victims to fierce, lawless play. As for the imported Jesuits and Seminary priests, they seem to have come under the very words of the statute, being "adherent to the king's enemies in his realm, giving them aid and comfort in the realm, or elsewhere." Popes who pretended to depose the sovereign and dissolve allegiance, could only be treated as enemies by all parties whom their bulls were likely to endanger. Even if their own absence from the realm might open a door for legal objections, they had partisans within it, unquestionable enemies to the sovereign, and the imported priests refused to disclaim that pontifical authority which such enemies were willing to put forward. Whatever execration, therefore, may be due to the law under which these unhappy clergymen suffered, it really imposed no peculiar hardship upon them. It was undoubtedly bad enough to take away their lives upon grounds, connected but indirectly with revolutionary politics, and this was rendered worse by the disgusting formalities of a savage and obscene butchery. But the same formalities were awarded to convicts of other descriptions, and really with little or nothing less of inhumanity, when the victims were thoughtless young men, who began in play and ended in riot. A fair judgment of the severities exercised upon papal emissaries can be made by none who do not know, or will not consider, the severities exercised upon their contemporaries.

that holds them to the last, early prepossessions remain unshaken. Essentially organised combinations, they are blindly moveable by a small compact knot of superiors. Even a sense of individual responsibility relaxes under such machinery. The old orders, however, had grown deficient in qualities of universal application. Friars and Benedictines, or the like, might still indeed be useful in retaining Romish influence, where it had been but slightly disturbed. In any country that wanted winning, they must be the very reverse, being certain of contempt as pampered idlers, or vulgar hypocrites, or dreaming fanatics. Loyola's devoted band, suggested by the Reformation, was the only one that monachism afforded able to cope with it. Supple on the surface, unbending at bottom, seemingly liberal, really bigoted, stern, persevering, accomplished, plausible, insinuating, shy of strict veracity, as of absolute falsehood, the Jesuit might effectually prop the falling fortunes of Rome. His tactics, under a favouring government, would be chiefly reprehensible by pandering to the vulgar appetite for superstition, cruelty, and absurdity. But Elizabeth was resolutely bent upon extinguishing his religion in her dominions, by a sort of natural death. Hence his operations upon England were necessarily entangled with politics. Mercuriano, general of the order, seems to have seen this formidable objection, and to have reasoned upon it like a Christian. Receiving English applications for a Jesuitic mission, he demurred[1]. Unfortunately, it may be, for his own peace of mind, certainly, for the credit of his order, Allen and the pope argued him out of this reluctance[1]. Having Englishmen under his control, he could, undoubtedly, command the very instruments most likely to succeed in a new experiment upon their native land. He gave consent for one, and made arrangements for trying it. Two Spanish Jesuits had been already in England, but ignorance of the language was found an insurmountable bar to their designs, and they quickly returned. The first English vassal of Loyola's institution, that trod his paternal soil, was Jasper Heywood, son of the epigrammatist[2]. He seems, however, to have been a pioneer of no great importance. Not so, the remarkable men, Persons and Campion, who soon followed at his heels. Their's was a regular *expedition*, to use Campion's word, and preparations for it excited lively interest in Rome. To it were attached, besides the leaders, seven other priests, and three laymen[3].

---

[1] "Mercurianus, the general of the Jesuits, assented to the request of Allen, that the members of his order might share in the dangers and the glory of the mission. For this purpose, he selected Robert Persons and Edmund Campian, two Englishmen of distinguished merit and ability." (LINGARD. viii. 171.) "The general was averse from the proposal, being very apprehensive that it would offend

Information of this movement soon reached England[4], and occasioned much uneasiness. The pope was

---

the Protestants, and raise divisions among the Catholics: but Pope Gregory XIII. enforced Allen's request." (BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* iii. 195.) Sanders represents the application for Jesuitic assistance as originating in England.—*De Schism. Angl.* 312.

[1] "Interposita quoque Pontificis maximi autoritate apud illius ordinis superiores." (SANDERS. *Ib.* 312.) Bartoli says, that Allen joined Gregory in combating the objections of Mercuriano.—76.

[2] CAMBDEN. 497.

[3] "In hac expeditione sumus patres Societatis duo, Robertus Personius et ego, sacerdotes alii septem, laici tres, quorum unus itidem noster est. Sumptu pontificis omnes proficiscimur." (EDMUND. CAMPIANI. *Epist.* 9. Bonon. Ap. 30, 1580. ad calcem *X. Ratt.* Antv. 1631. p. 404.) Bartoli states that a third Jesuit, "Ridolfo Emerson," was with Persons and Campion, also three priests of the English college, Ralph Sherwin, Luke Kirby, and Edward Rishton, besides "Tomaso Brusco, Alunno, e Giovanni Pasquale, Convittore." —*Dell' Ist. della Comp. di Giesu, l'Ingh.* 93.

[4] Given by "un malnato Sledo." —BARTOLI. 101.

to bear all expenses, and his new emissaries were to come from the most subtle of known confederacies. It became immediately a great object with Elizabeth's ministry to seize them upon arrival. For this purpose, strict orders were sent down to the several ports. Nor were verbal descriptions of Persons and Campion deemed sufficient. As good likenesses of them, as could be prepared, were also transmitted[1]. Bishop Goldwell and Dr. Morton were to have been of the party, but being both old,—one infirm, and the other taken ill,—they were under the necessity of returning to Rome[2].

Among appliances provided, was an explanation, truly Jesuitic, of the deposing bull hurled by Pius against Elizabeth. This was to be represented as *always binding against her and the heretics, though not at all so upon Catholics*, AS MATTERS STOOD, *but only when at length public execution of it should be attainable*[3]. Persons and Campion themselves requested permission to teach this doctrine. It passed for a mitigation of the offensive bull, but obviously, to many consciences, it must prove a snare. The reigning pope, however, Gregory XIII., wanted either the discernment, or the virtue, or the wisdom, to refuse, and it was granted under a regular papal faculty. What selfish or fiery spirit would not learn from such instruction to wait slily for the first safe treasonable opening? Then let slip the blood-hounds,—bigotry, cupidity, and vengeance.

---

[1] BARTOLI. 101.

[2] *Ib.* 99.

[3] "*Petatur a summo Domino nostro explicatio bullæ declaratoriæ per Pium Quintum contra Elizabetham, et ei adhærentes, quam Catholici cupiunt intelligi hoc modo, ut obliget semper illam et hæreticos, Catholicos vero nullo modo obliget, rebus sic stantibus, sed tum demum quando publica ejusdem bullæ executio fieri poterit.* Then followed many other petitions of faculties for their further authorities, which are not needful for this purpose to be recited: but in the end followeth this sentence as an answer of the Pope's; *Has prædictas gratias concessit Summus Pontifex patri Roberto Personio, et Edmundo Campiano in Angliam profecturis, die 14 Aprilis,* 1580. *Præsente patre Oliverio Manarco assistente.*" (BURGHLEY'S *Exec. of Justice.* 19.) Mr. Butler says, of this document, "It has been termed a mitigation of the bull of Pius. In respect of Elizabeth and her heretic subjects, it scarcely deserves that description; and as it recognises the principle of the bull of Pius, and suspends the action of it only until it might be executed, it was scarcely less objectionable than that very reprehensible document. It was, accordingly, the subject of vehement censure. *But what evil office*, says Father Allen, in his answer to Cecil, *have these good fathers done herein? What treason is committed more than if they had desired his Holiness to have discharged the Queen and the Pro-*

Robert Persons, who came over as provincial of his order[1], was born at Nether Stowey, in Somersetshire, in

---

testants also of all bond of that bull? How could either they, or the rest of the priests, doe more dutifullie and discreetlie in this case, than to provide that all such, with whom they onlie had to deale, might stand free and warranted in their obedience, and commit the rest, that cared not for excommunication, to the judgement of God?" (*Hist. Mem.* i. 197.) Mr. Hallam follows Allen. "This was designed to satisfy the consciences of some Papists in submitting to her government, and taking the oath of allegiance. But in thus granting a permission to dissemble, in hope of better opportunity for revolt, this interpretation was not likely to tranquillize her council, or conciliate them towards the Romish party. The distinction, however, between a king by profession, and one by right, was neither heard for the first, nor for the last time, in the reign of Elizabeth. It is the lot of every government, that is not founded on the popular opinion of legitimacy, to receive only a precarious allegiance." (*Const. Hist.*) Dr. Lingard reserves the mention of Gregory's explanatory faculty for a note at the end of his volume. In fact, its last two clauses are extremely unmanageable, wherever a fair front for Romanism is in hand. It is plain, that if Persons and Campion had acted merely as religious men, they would have requested Gregory to authorize them in teaching, that his predecessor's bull was in force only so far as excommunication went, deposition having been denounced under some mistake. Instead of which, they sought and obtained authority for telling their party, The pope bids you be quiet, *rebus sic stantibus*.

[1] *Important Considerations*. 62. "Il Personio in ufficio di Superiore." (BARTOLI. 93.) "Personius, cui missionis hujus cura tradita fuerat."—MOORE. 111.

1546, of humble parentage[1]. His enemies describe him as putative son of a blacksmith, named Cowback, his real father being John Haywood, vicar of the parish, and formerly canon regular of Tor Abbey, in Devonshire. From this clergyman he appears to have received school-instruction, and means of entering the university[2]; hence, probably, the scandalous tale of his birth. He was of Balliol College, Oxford, and became chaplain-fellow there, in 1568. He proceeded master of arts, in 1563. His manners were coarse, his temper violent[4], his dress and habits expensive, and his morals far from unsuspected. As dean of the college, he had punished a young man, named Bagshaw, afterwards, like himself, a convert to

---

[1] FOULIS'S *Romish Treasons.* Lond. 1681. p. 500.

[2] *Ibid.* SUTCLIFFE'S *Full and Round Answer to N. D., alias Robert Parsons, the Noddie.* Lond. 1604. pp. 90. 220.

[3] *Socius Sacerdos*, commonly called chaplain-fellow. — FOULIS. *ut supra.*

[4] Cambden, who was of his standing, and knew him at college, says, "This Parsons was of Somersetshire, a violent, fierce-natured man, and of a rough behaviour." (477.) "When he was yong, the fellow was much noted for his singular impudency and disorder in apparel, going in great barrell hose, as was the fashion of hacksters in those times, and drawing also deepe in a barrell of ale. Heare, I pray you, what A. C., the author of the masse priests' late supplication, sayth of him in his third letter. *He was,* saith A. C., *a common ale-house squire, and the drunkennest sponge in all the parish where he lived.* (SUTCLIFFE. 222.) A foul charge of incest, made by A. C., follows.

As the secular priests were highly offended by the arrival of the Jesuits, and especially so by the arrogance of Persons, he has met with as rough treatment from Romish hands, as from Protestant. Dr. James, accordingly, undertook to write his life entirely from Romish authorities; and in this way compiled a biting satire upon him, entitled, *The Jesuit's Downfall.* The order could not bear this, and bought up the book, which has hence become exceedingly scarce. Some of the statements in this, and other publications, are, probably, like those which libellers, conspirators, and intruders, generally provoke, either altogether false, or grossly exaggerated. But if Persons had borne a respectable character, contemporaries would have ventured upon no such liberties. What they say of his dress and manners is, probably, nothing more than truth.

Romanism. He was also obnoxious to Dr. Squire, the master, who thought some libels that annoyed him to be his writing[1]. Bagshaw became in due time fellow, and, still smarting under his juvenile disgrace, he cordially shared in the master's antipathy to Persons. In 1573, that remarkable man served as bursar in conjunction with another fellow, named Stancliff, whose wits were far less sharp than his own. Having thus the college accounts to manage pretty completely himself, a charge of peculation was raised against him. He was accused of dealing unfairly by his brethren upon the foundation, and of considerable frauds upon the independent members. If these imputations had been indubitable, the master, and others of the house, at variance with him, would, most probably, have used them for his expulsion. Instead of this, they charged him, strangely as it seems, with illegitimacy: a fatal objection by the statutes[2].

---

[1] "Of nature he was malicious, and from his youth given to speake evil, and to write libels. One libel he wrote against D. Squire, wherein he touched a certain ladie, which had like to have turned him to much trouble." (SUTCLIFFE. *ut supra.*) Dr. Abbot, formerly fellow of Balliol, afterwards master of University, and eventually archbishop of Canterbury, says, in a letter which contains, perhaps, the only authentic account of Persons, that Squire "thought himself to have been much bitten by vile libels, the author whereof he conceived Persons to be; and, in truth, was a man at that time wonderfully given to scoffing, and that with bitterness, which also was the cause that none of the company loved him." That his tastes and habits were libellous, *Leicester's Commonwealth*, and other such publications, either written by him, or connected with his name, sufficiently prove.

[2] "His office" (that of bursar,) "expired at St. Luke's tide: there were some that, between that and February, 1573, scanned over the books, being moved thereunto by the secret complaints of some of the commoners, their scholars; and finding it apparent, as also being now certified, that he was a bastard, (whereas it is the first quality there required by statute that every fellow should be *legitimo thoro natus*,) they proceeded to have his expulsion solemnly. Where by the way you may add, that Parsons was not of the best fame concerning incontinency, as

This was a difficulty that Persons would not meet, and he obviated a formal inquiry into its correctness, by requesting permission to resign his fellowship[1]. Not only was this request granted, but also another, that he might retain his rooms and pupils for the sake of keeping up a fair face to the world. He was likewise allowed

---

I have heard some say who lived in Oxon at that time: but whether that were then objected against him, I have not heard." (ABBOT'S *Letter. ut supra.*) Persons appears to have been the middle one of eleven children. If so, as no question is made upon the marriage of his ostensible parents, he could not have been legally a bastard. If, therefore, he shrank from this question, as it is plain from Archbishop Abbot's Letter that he did, it must have been from knowing some scandalous story about his mother to be in possession of his enemies. According to Sutcliffe, Sir John Haywood, as the reputed father of Persons, in compliance with usage, was called, lodged in old Cowback's house, and was a jolly sort of priest, "a mad jeasting knave," who had "lost one of his eares for conveying away an honest woman condemned to the gallowes." (*Full and Round Answer.* 220, 221.) The secular priest, Watson, author of the *Important Considerations*, and the *Quodlibets*, says, in the latter work, (p. 109,) "We may not imagine that Father Parsons was ignorant of his own estate, as being a sacrilegious bastard in the worst sense, *scilicet* a *spurius*, begotten by the parson of the parish where he was borne, upon the body of a very base queane." It certainly is rather suspicious that Persons (as he commonly wrote his name) should never have called himself after his reputed father: though this might be merely from that individual's very humble condition. The Romish writers represent him as uneasy and obnoxious at Balliol College, on account of the convictions that he had imbibed, and did not conceal, against Protestantism.

[1] "Ways sufficient concurring to expel him, and in truth, no man standing for him, he maketh humble request, that he might be suffered to resign; which, with some ado, was yielded to him." (ABBOT'S *Letter. ut supra.*) This letter enclosed the following entry from the college books. "Ego Robertus Parsons, Socius Collegii de Balliolo, resigno omne meum jus et clameum, quem habeo, vel habere potero societatis meæ in dicto collegio: quod quidem facio
non
sponte ~~et~~ coactus, die decimo tertio mensis Februarii, Anno Dom. 1573." In this, the *et* between *sponte* and *coactus* has a dash through it, and *non* is written above. The decree for his rooms, &c., seems to have been cancelled soon after, it being crossed-out.—FOULIS. *Romish Treasons.* 502.

commons, at the college expense, till Easter. His old enemy, Bagshaw, was, however, so delighted by the day's proceedings, that he had the bells rung in Magdalen Church, which stands close by, and has the college in its parish. The master, too, descended to some biting sarcasms, and the juniors eagerly insulted over him. Thus Balliol College soon became intolerable, and he withdrew to London. Thence he went abroad in June, and proceeding to Louvain, made some stay there, as he did subsequently at Padua. At first he thought of studying physic[1]. Afterwards, he determined upon becoming a civilian, and went to Bologna for acquiring the necessary qualification. Abandoning this object, apparently from failure of resources, he went to Rome, and became a Jesuit in June, 1575[2]. He was evidently possessed of great energy, and not wanting either in learning or ability. Nor, probably, were his morals nearly so defective as his enemies represented. But had they reached the average standard of respectability, he would have hardly fallen under such severe imputations. To talent or acquirement, he has not made good any extraordinary title. Undoubtedly he was largely instrumental in establishing a sect of English Romanists. But he laboured for that purpose as a scurrilous party politician, in the pay of Spain. Nor have those who profess his opinions any reason to be proud of his countenance to them, in spite of his alleged prepossessions in their favour, while professing a different creed. He was brought up a Protestant, and continued one to all appearance, until damaged in character, and quaking for his fellowship[1]. Nor does his Jesuitic profession stand upon more satisfactory ground; being, seemingly, the readiest resource open, when he was a destitute man in a foreign country. His return to England required, undoubtedly, considerable courage: but even here, was the man of humble origin, in needy circumstances, contemplating a political revolution, with its transfer of crown patronage to the party that he had adopted. Men, in far more promising circumstances than Persons, will face very serious risks upon such a speculation.

---

[1] Moore. 41.

[2] Dr. Abbot to Mr. Dr. Hussye. Feb. 1, 1601. Foulis, *ut supra.* Butler. *Hist. Mem.* iii. 168.

His principal confederate, Edmund Campion, was a Londoner of Protestant parents, born Jan. 25, 1540, and educated at Christ's Hospital. From this institution he removed to St. John's College, Oxford, where he took his master's degree, in 1564[2]. In 1568, he served the office of proctor[3]. In boyhood, he was known to have been imbued with a taste for Romanism, but when he grew up, this appeared extinct. He was, however, notorious for a suspicious fickleness and versatility[4]. Still, none had long any reason to doubt his continuance in the profession of Protestantism. He was regular in attendance upon its religious rites, ready to abjure Popery, and to dispute or preach against it. Zeal expressed for the Reformation had, indeed, even gained him some liberal presents[1]. From Richard Cheney, bishop of Gloucester, he received ordination to the diaconate, or, as he himself said eventually, *the mark of the beast.* In the same spirit, his ultimate friends talk of him as then undergoing an infamous pollution[2].

---

[1] "Parsons was of Balliol College, wherein he openly professed the Protestant religion, until he was for his loose carriage expelled with disgrace, and went over to the papists." (CAMBDEN. 477.) Bartoli says, that he left the college because he would not take orders. (91.) If he even alleged this, he must have been admitted to his fellowship, when incapable of discharging its duties, with an understanding that he would properly qualify himself on the first opportunity.

[2] DODD. ii. 137. BARTOLI.

[3] LE NEVE. 459.

[4] "Mutabilem et versatilem fuisse, et non raro spe lucri dissimulasse, aut metu simulasse, nunc istarum, nunc illarum, imo omnium partium fuisse, omnes norunt Oxonienses, qui meminerunt eum puerum hoc papismi odore imbutum, virum omnino eundem aliquoties abjurasse, profugum inter suos omnis religionis et jurisjurandi oblitum pristinam et puerilem salivam recepisse et ad ingenium rediisse."—HUMPHREY. *Ad Epist. Camp. Resp.*

The prelate, whose act is thus reviled, was noted for a strong bias towards Lutheranism, and Campion subsequently had hopes of bringing him over to Popery[3]. He seems to have adopted that creed himself in 1569, though not to have announced it formally until after another twelve months[1]. He then withdrew to Ireland, where he appears to have made some stay before, engaged in writing a history of the country[2]. From Ireland, an old and

---

[1] "Debetne gladiator iste vel timeri a vobis, vel amari a suis, vel ei credi ab ullo tuto potest, qui Oxoniæ professione sua, opinione nostra, Christianus fuit, quem Academia in complexu suo fovit, cui verbi divini lac præbuit, ad magistri titulum, ad Procuratoris dignitatem provexit, quem nobiscum contra Papatum sæpe et solenniter jurantem audivit, nobiscum in ecclesia iisdem sacris, et publica Liturgia utentem aspexit, quem ego et ad ministerium nostrum admissum, et ad suggestum Pauli, et ad gradum Baccalaureatus, et ad prælectionem theologiæ in collegio Magdalensi aspirantem, et multa sancte coram me et aliquot civibus Londinensibus promittentem protestantemque, et propterea liberaliter muneribus aliquoties affectum cognovi."—*Ib.*

[2] "Allora finalmente gli parve (così egli diceva) essergli del tutto cancellato e raso d'in su la fronte dell'anima il *Carattere della Bestia*, cioè la macchia di quel suo infelice Diaconato." (Bartoli. 84.) "Infami charactere pollui sustinuisset."—Moore. 38.

[3] His letter to this *pseudo-episcopus*, as he politely calls him, is dated Nov. 1, 1571. He reminds him in it, of advising deference to the authority of the Church, Councils, and the Fathers. No doubt he attributed his own conversion to the following of this advice. But it might have been as well to remember, that his adopted mode of appropriating the Church, was begging the question; and to observe, that his dependance upon councils, was almost entirely confined to the Trentine; and to recollect that the fathers must speak at least ambiguously, because learned Protestants claim them quite as much as Romanists; and to be sure, besides, that in quoting fathers, he was not quoting forgeries. Cheney's variations from the creed generally received, he represents as turning upon Christ's true presence in the altar, and free will. Hence he pronounces him not so stupid as to follow the heresy of the Sacramentaries, nor so mad as to identify himself completely with the Lutheran faction. He paints him, accordingly, as the

---

shame of the Catholics, a tale for the vulgar, the grief of his friends, and the laughing-stock of his enemies. He thinks him, however, to have gone far enough, perhaps, for securing a less share of eternal torments than Judas, Luther, Zuingle, Cooper, Humphrey, or Sampson. But he roundly says, that his torments, such as they may prove, will be partly owing to perpetual attacks from the *manes* of Calvin, Zuingle, Arius, Sabellius, Nestorius, Wickliffe, Luther; in whose hostile company, joined with that of the devil and his angels, he would belch out blasphemies. More of the same kind is to be found in this letter, which is rather below a correspondent of thirty-one, being written in the declamatory style of a full-grown school-boy, clever, but impudent, specious, but at bottom, violent. It appears from it, that Bishop Cheney had taken great notice of Campion, captivated, probably, by his winning manners, and promising qualifications. Even men of considerable depth and severity of judgment, are not quick in discerning the self-conceit of such a youth, or they readily pass over it, as a defect which time will wear away. It might have done so, in poor Campion's case, had he been in less of a hurry to commit himself. (EDM. CAMPION. R. Cheneo, Pseudo-episc. Glouc. ad calcem. X. *Ratt.* 363. 365. 370. 364. 366. 376. 362.) Bishop Cheney, who died in 1578, had maintained Edward's reformation, in the first convocation under Mary, but he seems never to have cordially agreed with the exiles who came from abroad, on Elizabeth's accession. Hence he was commonly branded as a Lutheran, or semi-Papist. Bartoli says, "Egli era in verità Luterano, ma solo in certi articoli; nel rimanente havea del Cattolico, quanto pur troppo gli valeva a far de' Cattolici Luterani. Sentiva come noi del libero arbitrio, come noi della reale e durevol presenza di Christo nell' Eucharistia."—81.

[1] Dodd says that he forsook the Church of England, in 1569; but he dates a letter to R. Stanihurst, from St. John's College, Oxford, Dec. 1, 1570. Bartoli makes him to have spent the year 1569 in Ireland, and to have withdrawn by the private advice of Sir Henry Sidney, the northern rebellion having occasioned inquiries after Romanists.—82, 83.

[2] Bridgewater makes him to have gone to Ireland for literary purposes. "Cum studia literarum prosequens, Hyberniam invisisset, cujus provinciæ historiam non minus vere quam eleganter conscripsit." (*Concert. Eccl. Cath.* 52.) Supposing him to have gone into Ireland, under plea of literature, while yet not publicly committed to Romanism, in 1569, and to

intimate friend allured him to Douay, where he was made professor of divinity[1]. Subsequently, he resided for several years at Prague, and was ordained priest there, by Anthony, the archbishop[2]. The Austrian states had slipped pretty completely from the grasp of Rome, and their princes were anxious to see them re-conquered. The Jesuits were actively and successfully embarked in this undertaking. Campion must have joined that society, soon after his expatriation, for he describes himself as eight years a member, on his return to England[3]. He did not, indeed, take up Romanism by halves. He could even make application, with seeming sincerity, to the Virgin, and others, once on earth, now placed, apparently, far enough beyond mortal call[4].

---

have gone thither again, after his public avowal, in 1570, this portion of his history will be clear enough. He finally left Dublin, in disguise, and under a feigned name, in consequence of inquiries after him. (MOORE. 37.) He was, probably, thought somewise implicated in the northern rebellion; but had Sir Henry Sidney entertained a very bad opinion, either of him or his case, he would have hardly given him advice and facilities to escape.

[1] Edm. Camp. Greg. Martino, Societatis Jesu. Prag. e coll. Soc. Jesu. July 10, 1577. (p. 393.) Gregory Martin was of his own college and standing. Campion seems, by a letter to James Stanihurst, March 20, 1571, to have gone to Dublin, immediately upon the formal announcement of his conversion.—BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* iii. 196.

[2] *Decem Rationes.* Antv. 1631. p. 50.

[3] Campion to the Privy Council. STRYPE. *Annals.* iii. Append. VI. p. 184.

[4] Among the nonsense which he puts into a florid oration, recited seemingly, by some youth, he draws a picture of Jesus, enraged by the wickedness of the age, on the point of striking, comminuting, and exterminating this progeny, so dire, so pestiferous; while the Virgin falls at his knees, and appeals to her outstretched hands that had handled him, to the teats that he had sucked, to the face that had kissed him, to the breast pierced by the sword of his passion, to the arms that had carried him, to the bosom in which he had lain, now crying, now sleeping, now sucking. (EDM. CAMP. Orat. I. ad calc. *X. Ratt.* p. 207.) It is painful to translate such matter, at once ludicrous and revolting. But when its unfortunate, and really amiable author, is known to have taught divinity in two col-

Receiving a summons from Bohemia, he travelled, under orders, to Innspruck, in one of Prince Ferdinand's carriages. Hence he went to Padua on foot[1]. There he found an immediate call to Rome[2]. To that city he journeyed on horseback, his expenses being defrayed by a brother Jesuit, whom he had fortunately met on the road; his own money was exhausted. On reaching Rome, he spent about a week, incessantly occupied with preparations for departure to his native land. Being a pennyless foreigner, who had bound himself to do a chosen superior's will, he could not decline this perilous expedition[3], although his heart rather failed him, when the mind seriously dwelt upon it[4]. He was, in fact, a mild, good-natured man, of unblemished morals, the very opposite of Persons, and had he either continued a Protestant, or lived in a more peaceful time, he might have gone to his grave

---

leges, and is put forth as leader in a religious movement, it is desirable that people, who are little likely to read, or even see his remains, should be able to judge of his fitness to guide others. Even when detained by contrary winds on the French coast, from passing over, upon his fatal expedition, into England, he tells the general, Mercuriano, that he had often commended his cause and his journey to his tutelary saint, John the Baptist, and that he got a favourable gale on the evening of his day. (Epist. X. p. 409.) Yet this frothy declaimer of an anile superstition affects, in his letter to Bishop Cheney, to feel a qualm of conscience for having neglected, in some of his private interviews with him, to admonish him upon his defective religious views. That is, a professed divine, of some learning, who could write in this manner of the Virgin, and other departed persons, when over thirty, and even up to the time that he was actually forty, paints himself as to blame, when a trifle over twenty, for not lecturing a bishop, of considerable professional eminence, now verging upon sixty. Whatever this rash, ill-used victim wanted, it could not be conceit.

[1] Edm. Camp. uni ex PP. Soc. Jes. Ep. IX. p. 404.

[2] "Statim audio: Romam propera."—*Ib.* 405.

[3] "Romæ cum hærerem ad circiter octo dies, plus quam toto itinere laborabam temporis penuria."—*Ib.* 406.

[4] "Omnes video tam prodigos sanguinis et vitæ, ut me pœniteat ignaviæ meæ."—*Ib.* 404.

in happiness, and with every one's good word. But his amiable qualities, joined with considerable attainments, and shewy talents, naturally rendered him popular, and, wanting ballast, he readily suffered himself to be caressed into overpowering self-conceit. This palpable defect in his character was, probably, the root of all his misery. It betrayed him to apostasy, betrayed him to that hasty sacrifice of professional independence, which made him the half-reluctant tool of those on whom he depended, and to whom had vowed blind obedience[1]; it lured him with visionary hopes of gaining glory, where cooler heads would only fear defeat.

On the Sunday after Easter, Gregory gave his blessing to the missionaries, and they left Rome, with instructions from their general, Mercuriano, to keep entirely clear of politics[2]. They were to pass through Rheims, Paris, and Douay[3]. On the French coast, Persons and Campion separated. The latter landed at Dover, early on the morning of June 25. Persons trode again his native soil, at some other point. Campion was no sooner on shore, than he had to attend the local magistrate, who charged him with being a fugitive English Romanist, returning under a feigned name to propagate his religion. Had he gone no farther, the missionary would, probably, have been unable to lull suspicion, but he insisted that no other than Allen stood before him. Not even the slightest appearance of art was required in rebutting this charge, and

---

[1] Campion said of himself, "Venisse Roma in Angliam ex præpositi Generalis decreto, ea animi alacritate qua in aliam quamcumque orbis regionem profecturus fuisset, si Generali visum esset."—Moore. 74.

[2] Bartoli. 93. Butler. *Hist. Mem.* iii. 196.

[3] Edm. Camp. uni ex PP. Soc. Jes. 407.

Campion offered, at once, to deny it upon oath. Still, the magistrate kept saying, to his very great alarm, that he must be sent in custody to the council, and, seemingly, with such a view, he left the room. During his absence, the Jesuit became absorbed in mental prayer, not forgetting to intermingle with rational, natural, and becoming addresses to Omniscience, others to the Baptist. He was delighted, no less than surprised, on the old man's return, to hear him say, "You may go. Farewell." Of this unexpected permission, instant and effective advantage was taken, and Campion was not long in reaching London. He necessarily moved about in disguise, but his party soon became extensively aware of his return to England. Some young men of fortune instantly supplied him with clothes, and everything that he could want. He now found himself almost overwhelmed with professional avocations, obliged even to think of his sermons, as he rode on horseback from house to house, in the neighbouring country[1].

The two Jesuit missionaries, having gained sufficient footing, began to act in strict accordance with their several natures. Persons went straight on towards his own selfish ends. Forgetting his general's advice to abstain from politics, or understanding it in some equivocating way, he soon supplied such stimulating food as was relished by discontented spirits of his party. A sovereign of Catholic principles, he maintained, might easily be decorated with a crown that sate so unworthily upon illegitimate, usurping, and heretical brows[2]. The royal personage to benefit by this transfer, was Mary of Scotland, whose best friends appear to have become alarmed. Any of those machinations, to make England a province of Spain, which shed new infamy over his latter years, were unnecessary while she lived. It is added, with great probability, that he went so far as to prepare lists of Romish malcontents, who might, with assistance from the duke of Guise, effect the desired revolution[1]. Serious Romanists, desirous only of a spiritual supply from abroad, were naturally disgusted on finding themselves harbouring a political conspirator and incendiary, instead of a grave father confessor. Others were alarmed at being made the depositaries of such dangerous secrets. They knew the vigilance of their government, and reasonably calculated upon the early discovery of any traitorous movements. Hence Persons received an intimation, that if he did not completely turn his attention from revolutionary politics to professional duties, the Romish party would itself discover his practices, and

---

[1] Edm. Camp. Ever. Mercurian. Præp. Gen. Soc. Jes. Epist. X. p. 410.

[2] "Mr. Parsons presently fell to his Jesuitical courses, and so belaboured both himself and others in matters of state, how he might set her majesty's crown upon another head (as appeareth by a letter of his own to a certain earl)

---

that the Catholics themselves threatened to deliver him into the hands of the civil magistrate, except he desisted from such kind of practices."—*Important Considerations.* 63.

[1] "Those who know your practices" (*i. e.* of Jesuits) "in the countries, where you, by the means ordinarily of deluded wives, govern the great ones, know this to be your maxime, to manage religion, not by persuasion, but by command and force. This principle did your chief apostle in England, Robert Parsons, bring in with him. His first endeavours were to make a list of Catholicks, which, under the conduct of the Duke of Guise, should have changed the state of the kingdom, using for it the pretence of the title of Queen Mary of Scotland. But her council at Paris, which understood business better, were so sensible of his boldness, that they took from him the Queen's cypher, which he had purloyned, and commanded him never more to meddle in her affairs." (*The Jesuits' Reasons Unreasonable: or Doubts proposed to the Jesuits upon their Paper presented to divers Persons of Honour, for non-exception from the Common Favour voted to Catholicks*, p. 101.) This tract was written by a Romanist, and first printed in 1662. The copy used

surrender him into custody[1]. Campion was led away by his habitual vanity. Feeling sure that his change of religion was a convincing proof of discernment, learning, and ability, he panted for a theatre to display these qualifications. What could follow but glory to himself, and conviction to every candid looker-on? Hence he boasted of irrefragable arguments ready for a powerful impression, and expressed anxiety to confound his adversaries by a public challenge to debate with them the grounds of their belief. Grave Romanists heard all this vaunting with uneasiness, perhaps also with some disgust[2]. Englishmen of their principles have now been widely separated so long from the Protestant majority, that neither party can judge personally of the other. In Elizabeth's earlier years, the two parties had been educated in the same colleges, and were aware, from knowledge and observation, of each other's powers. Hence the thoughtful Romish scholar, however confident in the superiority of his own cause, felt habitually that he was

---

is a reprint of 1675, appended to the *Execution of Justice*, and the *Important Considerations*.

[1] *Imp. Cons. ut supra.* "Parsons, who was constituted superior, being a man of a seditious and turbulent spirit, and armed with a confident boldness, tampered so far with the Papists about deposing the Queen, that some of 'em, I speak upon their own credit, thought to have delivered him into the magistrate's hands."—CAMBDEN. 477.

[2] "These good fathers, as the devil would have it, come into England, and intruded themselves into our harvest, being men, (in our consciences, we mean both them, and others of that society, with some of their adherents,) who have been the chief instruments of all the mischiefs that have been intended against her Majesty, since the beginning of her reign, and of the miseries, which we, or any other Catholicks, have upon these occasions sustained. Their first repair hither was *Anno* 1580, when the realm of Ireland was in great combustion, and they entered (*viz.* Mr. Campion, the subject, and Mr. Parsons, the provincial) like a tempest, with sundry such great brags and challenges, as divers of the gravest clergy then living in England (Dr. Watson, bishop of Lincoln, and others) did greatly dislike them."—*Imp. Cons.* 62.

pitted against adversaries not easily refuted. Nor probably were the cooler heads of his party without some distrust of Campion's competence, if severely tested. At all events they were apprehensive that any considerable movement in their party would awaken suspicion in the government, and provoke new legislative severities[1].

To justify a call for such, it was only necessary to look at Ireland. In England, as the government was strong, emissaries might land from Rome, with prudent instructions to abstain from politics, and all interference with them might be colourably branded as religious persecution. But even if the papal fountain must have credit for sending forth sweet waters into one island, none will deny that it poured a bitter stream into the other. In the last summer, Nicholas Sanders, the cherished Romish historian and controversialist, landed at Smerwick, in Kerry, with a commission from the pope to act as legate. He came in the train of James Fitzmaurice, brother to the earl of Desmond, who had been long importuning foreign courts, for the means of carrying rebellion into his native land. At first, he sought attention for his plans from France. But meeting there only with derision, equivocation, and delay, he tempted again the cupidity of Philip[2]. That ambitious and bigoted prince referred him to the pope; from whom he got a small sum of money, letters of recommendation to the Spanish government, and a consecrated banner. In this way through Spain he collected a small body of soldiers to rally round it. Besides the new legate, he had with him an Irish Jesuit, named Allen, and the party landed at Smerwick, in July, 1579[1]. A piece of ground was immediately consecrated, but it was to build a fort; and in this the party found a winter's refuge. In February following, Sanders issued a circular letter to the nobility and gentry of Ireland, shamefully abusing the queen,

---

[1] *Imp. Cons.* 62.

[2] Thomas Stukeley, a profligate spendthrift, said by Burghley to have fled from England "for notable piracies, and out of Ireland for treacheries not pardonable," took refuge in Italy, and wheedled himself into the confidence of Pius V. by plans for the conquest of Ireland. Gregory XIII. was more delighted with this bragging, impudent, unprincipled adventurer, even than his bigoted predecessor, for he had an illegitimate son, James Buoncampagno, whom he had lately made marquess of Vineola, and whom Stukeley promised to establish as king in Ireland. On the strength of this promise, Gregory created Stukeley, marquess of Leinster, and fitted him out, in 1578, at Civitá Vecchia, with a force of 800 men. He then sailed to the Tagus, where his troops

were to be joined by a body of Spaniards and Portuguese, under the command of Sebastian, king of Portugal. That prince, however, was then on the point of sailing upon his fatal expedition against Morocco, in which Stukeley was prevailed upon to accompany him, and he there perished with him. Philip had, on Sebastian's death, sufficient occupation in appropriating his kingdom, and hence was neither able to think seriously of Ireland, nor even of his own embarrassments in the Netherlands. (CAMBDEN. 431. 462. TURNER's *Elizabeth.* ii. 340.) Dr. Lingard says that Stukeley's force was only 600 strong, but he adds, which Cambden does not mention, that Gregory supplied him with 3,000 stand of arms, and a ship of war. Bishop Carleton says strongly, though not unfairly, "By this pageant we may observe how zealous these holy fathers of Rome are, not to win souls to Christ, but to win kingdoms to their bastards. Two popes proceed in the same course of malice and malediction against Queene Elizabeth, and one English fugitive makes them both fooles." (*Thankful Remembrance.* 37.) He says likewise that Philip, who was to pay the troops that Stukeley brought from Italy, was the more easily persuaded to his joining Sebastian's Moorish expedition from disgust at Gregory's project for Buoncampagno. The pontiff had engaged "to confer all the British dominions upon the king of Spain, provided that prince could conquer them." (PHELAN's *Policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland.* Lond. 1827. p. 162. note.) "In the bull of his predecessor, Ireland had not been named: but the omission was now supplied; and Gregory signed, though he did not publish, a new bull, by which Elizabeth was declared to have forfeited the crown of Ireland, no less than that of England."—LINGARD. viii. 154.

[1] CAMBDEN. 472. Dr. Lingard says, "He had brought with him no more than eighty Spanish soldiers, a few Irish and English exiles, and the celebrated Dr. Sanders in the capacity of papal legate."—155.

denouncing her as illegitimate, and declaring that the pope would prevent any but a Catholic from succeeding her[1]. This "honest apostle[2]," had also, for encouragement in rebellion, a plenary indulgence from Gregory, which speaks of Elizabeth as *hateful to God and man*[3], and offers to all who should any way aid the expedition, the same purgatorial exemptions that were to be earned by warring against the Turks. In furtherance of these papal orders upon another world, a body of seven hundred Italians and Spaniards, with five thousand stand of arms, and a rich military chest, landed soon after at Smerwick, under the command of San Giuseppe, an Italian officer. But this unhappy band was only lured upon a sanguinary fate. No insurrection of any consequence greeted its arrival, and, being compelled to surrender at discretion, it was inhumanly put to the sword[4]. What became of Sanders, the deluder and deluded, is not certainly known. But he died soon after in concealment, all say miserably, which can hardly be doubted, and some say insane[5].

---

[1] ELLIS's *Original Letters.* Second Series. iii. 95.

[2] "Sawnders theyr honest apostle."—Lord Grey to Queen Elizabeth, Dublin, August 12, 1580. *Queen Elizabeth and her Times.* ii. 111.

[3] "Deo pariter et hominibus infesta."—*Ib.* 94.

[4] CAMBDEN. 475. This cruelty appears to have been perpetrated by the soldiers and sailors as they sought for spoil, and not from the determination of a council of war, as it has been commonly believed.—Sir R. Bingham to the Earl of Leicester. Smerwick-road, November 11, 1580. *Queen Elizabeth and her Times.* ii. 122.

[5] Cambden, after relating the death of Gerald Fitz-Gerald, eleventh earl of Desmond, in 1583, who was then discovered lurking in a cottage, and slain by a common soldier, says, that he "forfeited his allegiance to his prince, through the persuasion of certain priests. The principal of whom was Nicholas Sanders, an Englishman, who, very near the same time, was miserably famish'd to death, when forsaken of all, and troubled in mind, for the bad success of the rebellion; he wander'd up and down amongst woods, forests, and mountains, and found no comfort, or relief. In his pouch were found several speeches and letters made and written to confirm the rebels,

While his enterprise was raging, or even recent, what nation, or what ministry, would, or could believe, that another commission, like his, from Rome, was not another menace to life and property? The agents might produce instructions to preach peace, *as matters stood*, but who would doubt the pope's intention to let them stand so no longer than he could help? It must have appeared mere suicidal folly to trust Jesuits with mass-books, on one side of a narrow sea, coming from the very same hostile power that sent soldiers in arms to the other side, and at the very same time too.

This reasonable view is taken by a royal proclamation that appeared soon after the two Jesuits had arrived in England[1]. The very name of their order being new, is treated as an artful assumption to deceive and circumvent the simple[2]. All people, having children, wards, or others under their control, or receiving pecuniary assistance from them, in any foreign country, were to return the names of such individuals to the ordinary, within ten days, and to take measures for recalling them within four months. All persons receiving, sustaining, cherishing, or relieving Jesuits, Seminarists, Massifying-priests[3], or any such, that have come, or may hereafter, from abroad;

---

stuff'd with large promises from the Pope and the Spaniard." (*Eliz.* 495.) Dodd represents this account as inaccurate, Sanders really having died of a flux in the latter end of 1580. (*Ch. Hist.* ii. 76.) With this chronology Sutcliffe agrees, representing Sanders to have died about the time that Smerwick was taken. (*Full and Round Answ.* 82.) He appears to have acted as paymaster to the invading force. (TURNER. iv. 390. note.) Burghley says that he "dyed raving in a phrensie." (*Execution of Justice.* 34.) The Jesuit Allen was slain in the battle of Monaster Neva.—PHELAN. 163.

[1] July 15. *De Schism. Angl.* 327.

[2] "Ut sub specie tam sancti nominis decipiant et circumveniant simplices."—*Ib.* 329.

[3] "Missificantes sacerdotes."—*Ib.* 330.

or not discovering such, if known, or probably suspected, were to be treated as sustainers, favourers, and patrons of rebellious and seditious men. The imported ecclesiastics themselves were also branded as nefarious ministers, and dangerous instruments for the subversion of national peace and tranquillity. For the justice of such charges, an appeal was made to the existing state of Ireland[1].

The same unquestionable ground was taken by Sir Walter Mildmay, chancellor of the exchequer, in proposing to parliament[2], new measures of coercion against Romanists. He called attention to the various aggressions of Rome, from the northern rebellion, to the late invasion of Ireland[3]. A House of Commons, less leavened with Puritanism than that which heard him, must have felt some new precautions against papal malice, to be demanded by a due regard for public tranquillity, and national independence. The remedy provided was, however, excessive. Reconcilements to the Church of Rome were made high treason, in the dispenser, misprision of treason, in the receiver. The saying of mass was made punishable, by a fine of 200 marks, and one year's imprisonment; the hearing of it, by half the fine, but the same term of imprisonment. Absence from church was to be finable by 20l. a month, and if continued through a year, two securities, in 200l. each, might be demanded for the party's good behaviour. To prevent the harbouring of papal agents under colour of tuition, schoolmasters, unlicensed by the ordinary, were made liable to a year's imprisonment, and persons employing them to a fine of 10l. a month[1]. Such laws are absurd, yet intensely cruel. The very makers of them shrink from their execution. Hence, they irritate, instead of crushing. Here and there, however, some unhappy victim feels the full weight of their merciless severity. Nor can they fail of keeping individuals under their lash, in constant uneasiness, and in danger of shameful extortion. The Romish party could not think of Ireland, without expecting new restrictions. But it was justified in complaining, that parliament had legislated against internal disorder, and foreign aggression, in a tyrannical and vindictive spirit[1].

---

[1] "Prospiciens sua Majestas et prævidens hoc ingens malum, quod per tam nefarios ministros, et instrumenta periculosa consequi possit, cujus rei exemplum et experimentum nimis recens jam nunc in regno Hiberniæ vidimus."—*De Schism. Angl.* 329.

[2] Jan. 25, 1581.

[3] "The Pope turned thus the venom of his curses and the pens of his malicious parasites into men of war and weapons, to win that by force, which otherwise he could not do. And though all these are said to be done by the Pope, and in his name, yet who seeth not that they be maintained underhand by some princes, his confederates? And if any man be in doubt of that, let him but note from whence the last invasion of Ireland came, of what country the ships, and of what nation the most part of the soldiers were, and by the direction of whose ministers they received their victual and furniture."—D'Ewes. 285.

---

[1] BUTLER. iii. 205. "It is plain that if these provisions had been fully executed, the profession of the Catholic creed must, in a few years, have been entirely extinguished." (LINGARD. viii. 173.) "When you reconcile them, you take assurance of them by vow, oath, or other adjuration, that they shall embrace the Catholike faith, and hold communion and unitie with the Church of Rome for ever after. Then when it pleaseth my lord, the Pope, to deprive the Prince, and to excommunicate al that assist or agnise her for a lawful magistrate, what must your reconciled sort doe? Is it not against their oath, and faith given to you at their restitution to the bosom of the Catholike Church, as you terme it, to obay their Prince against the censures of your Church?" (BISHOP BILSON'S *True Difference betweene Christian Subjection, and Unchristian Rebellion.* Oxf. 1585. p. 820.) In thinking of these reconcilements, the confessional should never be forgotten. Men to tamper habitually with the consciences of others are bad enough at any time, but when Gregory was pretending to depose the queen, and Philip was endeavouring to gain a hostile footing in her territories, such men from abroad, all connected with Rome, and some with Spain, naturally wore a most suspicious aspect. Their instructions came from the very same quarters with those of Sanders and Allen. No doubt, they were different, but who would doubt that a favourable opening would soon bring new instructions perfectly identical?

Although the Jesuit missionaries were variously disguised, and skilfully concealed, indications of their presence daily transpired. They caused, in fact, considerable commotion in the whole Romish body. The secular priests especially, who had never emigrated, were disgusted by the interference of men with a new papal commission, and claiming a tacit superiority over themselves. Hence arose that quarrel between seculars and Jesuits, which long acted unfavourably on the Romish cause, and to which posterity is indebted for many curious and important disclosures. Nor were the Jesuits themselves models of perfect unanimity. Heywood, presuming, perhaps, upon his first arrival[2], displayed a degree of importance which Persons could not brook[3]. He took upon himself, indeed, eventually, to hold a sort of synod, which abolished various ancient customs, dear to the prejudices of many[1].

---

[1] "To confess something to our own disadvantage, and to excuse the said Parliament; if all the Seminary priests, then in England, or which should after that time have come hither, had been of Mr. Morton's and Mr. Saunders mind before mentioned, (when the first excommunication came out,) or Mr. Saunders his second resolution (being then in arms against her Majesty in Ireland) or of Mr. Parsons traiterous disposition both to our Queen and country: the said law, no doubt, had carried with it a far greater shew of justice. But that was the error of the state, and yet not altogether, for ought they knew, improbable, those time times being so full of many dangerous designs and Jesuitical practices."—*Important Considerations.* 67.

[2] It appears, that the statement of Heywood's first arrival is to be taken with some qualification, it really meaning that he was the first Jesuit who made any stay in England. Mr. Butler says, that Ribadeneira and another Spanish Jesuit had been in England before him, but inability to speak the language was found a hopeless impediment, and they departed almost immediately.—*Hist. Mem.* iii. 194.

[3] He "took so much upon him, that Father Persons fell out exceedingly with him, and great troubles grew among Catholicks by their brabblings and quarrels."—*Important Considerations.* 67.

Soon after their arrival, Persons and Campion contrived an interview in London, and held a general meeting of the missionaries. Persons presided, and spoke loudly of the general, Mercuriano's charge, to abstain from politics. He swore, however, to his hearers, that no such caution really was required by himself, having none but spiritual objects in view, and that he had only mentioned politics, to prevent any missionary from using language, likely to give the government offence[2]. What instructions did Mercuriano give to his brother Jesuit, Allen, when he sailed just now for Ireland, with a papal legate, a band of soldiers, warlike stores, and orders upon purgatory to stimulate rebellion? This question, asked by existing circumstances, threw an air of insincerity over the provincial's becoming speech. He dwelt also upon the Trentine decision against attending church. Romish prejudices could only thus be retained invulnerable, and ignorance of Protestant opinions acquire sufficient crassitude. He pressed, likewise, the necessity of organising some plan for future missionary operations. This met with a willing audience. Many priests at once admitted him as a sort of superior, and acted under his direction. Others repudiated his authority, as a pernicious innovation, and an unwarrantable assumption[3]. Thus the

---

[1] "A synod was held by him, the said Mr. Heywood, and sundry ancient customs were therein abrogated to the offence of very many." (*Imp. Cons.*) It seems that this synod was not held until after the lapse of two years; if, at least, it be the same that Mr. Butler mentions, which abolished some ancient fasts, peculiar to the unreformed Church of England, and exacted a stricter conformity with Rome. Heywood was now superior of his order, and his innovation giving offence, he was recalled.—*Hist. Mem.* iii. 200.

[2] *Ib.* 199.

[3] *Ib.* 201.

Romish body no sooner gained a new and powerful impulse, than partial paralysis impaired its vigour.

Before their separation, in the skirts of London, after spending together one of the last evenings in July, the two Jesuits prepared formal answers to Elizabeth's proclamation[1]. Persons so disposed of his, that nothing is now known of it[2]. Campion's has been preserved. It positively disclaims every political object, but announces that the Jesuits had made a holy league to root Romanism, in England, at all hazards. Prisons, racks, and gibbets are treated with scorn, sufficient victims being prepared to answer all their demands, and a new succession being certain to repair every devastation that such barbarities might cause. A copy of this document was entrusted to Thomas Pound, a zealous Romanist of good family, who was himself a Jesuit[3]. He had injunctions to suppress it so long as the writer should remain at large, but in case of his apprehension, to print and circulate it. The original, Campion retained. Pound, who is represented as panting for Tyburn[4], seems to have been fired by such a display of rhetoric, zeal, and heroism. He printed it immediately, and it was neither long in getting wind, nor eliciting replies: Hammer and Charke having instantly attacked it. Among its contents was a desire to argue the Romish cause, before the council, a select body of divines, and another of civilians[1].

---

[1] Persons went into the counties of Northampton, Gloucester, Hereford, Derby, and those adjoining; Campion into the north. (Moore. 75.) Meaning to pass thither, it seems, through the counties of Berks, Oxford, and Northampton. —Bartoli. 112.

[2] "Tomaso Pondo, quel santo confessore, e prigionere per fede Cattolica, hebbe in disposito quella del P. Campiano: il Personio la fidò a non so chi altro."—*Ib.* 113.

[3] Thomas Pound, son of William, and of Anne Wriothesley, sister to the Earl of Southampton, was born May 29, 1539. (*Ib.* 51.) He joined the Jesuits, Dec. 1, 1578. —*Ib.* 58.

[4] "La cui ammirabil vita fu, come dissi, un continuo martirio di trenta anni, e tanto a lui piu acerbo, quanto egli piu focosamente desiderava di terminarlo al Tiborno di Londra."—*Ib.* 59.

That he might secure some such notice for his opinions, under any circumstances, Campion produced, in the next year, his *Ten Reasons*[2], addressed to the most learned academicians of Oxford and Cambridge[1]. This tract, which is elegantly written, but floridly, arrogantly, and superficially, was extensively circulated by means of William Hartley, once, like the writer, fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, now like him also, a Romish missionary[2]. Among his own party, and among all such as are easily smitten by the charms of composition, Campion's flowers passed at once for fruit. William Whitaker, however, the learned regius professor of divinity at Cambridge, was not slow in taking up the gauntlet, so confidently thrown down, and many sufficient judges, with great reason, pronounced his answer complete[1]. In some points, indeed, he had a task needlessly easy, the Jesuitic challenger having found Scripture for his purposes, in the Apocrypha, and fathers, in pieces even then known to be suppositious[2]. But Whitaker was not allowed an undisputed victory. Before the year closed, John Durey, a scholarly Scottish Jesuit, published at Ingoldstadt, a *Con-*

---

[1] "I do ascribe to the glory of God, with all humility, and your correction, three sorts of indifferent and quiet audience. The first before your honours; wherein I will discourse of religion so far forth as it toucheth the commonwealth, and your nobilities. The second, whereof I make most account, before the doctors and masters of the chosen men of both universities; wherein I undertake to avow the faith of our Catholic Church by proofs invincible, Scriptures, councils, fathers, histories, natural and moral reason. The third before the lawyers, spiritual and temporal; wherein I will justify the same faith by common wisdom of law, standing yet in force and practice.

"I should be loth to speak anything that might sound of an insolent brag, or challenge, especially being now as a dead man to the world, and willing to cast my head under every man's foot, and to kiss the ground they tread upon: yet have I such courage in advancing the majesty of Jesus, my king, and such affiance in his gracious favour, and such assurance in my quarrel, and my evidence so impregnable, that because I know perfectly that none of those Protestants, nor all the Protestants living, nor any sect of our adversaries, howsoever they face men down in their pulpits, and over-rule us in their kind of grammarians, and unlearned sort, can maintain their doctrine in disputation, I am most humbly and earnestly for the combat with them all, or every of them, or the principal that may be found; protesting, that in this trial, the better furnished they come, the better welcome they shall come to me.

* * * *

"As touching our society, be it known unto you, that we have made a league, all the Jesuites in the world, whose succession and multitude must over-reach all the practices of England, cheerfully to carry the cross that you shall lay upon us, and never to despair your recovery, while we have a man left to enjoy your Tyburn, or to be racked with your torments, or to be consumed by your poysons. Expences are reckoned, the enterprise is begun: it is of God, it cannot be withstood. So the faith was planted, so it must be restored." (Campion to the Privy Council. STRYPE. *Annals.* iii. Append. VI. p. 185.) The particulars as to this letter are to be found in Campion's own preface to the *Decem Rationes.* His indiscreet friend, Pound, described as *nobilis laicus*, *insignis confessor*, was committed to the Tower, Aug. 31, 1581.

[2] "Which the Catholiques account an epitome of all their doctrine, labouring to prove that the Fathers were all Papists."—HARRINGTON'S *Nugæ Antiqu.* i. 224.

---

[1] *Decem Rationes Propositæ in Causa Fidei.* The tract comprises 117 pages, 12mo. The Reasons are, 1. Scripture. 2. Interpretation thereof. 3. The Church. 4. Councils. 5. Fathers. 6. Their authority. 7. History. 8. Paradoxes. 9. Sophisms. 10. Witnesses of all kinds.—1. Luther's mention of doubts as to the Epistle of St. James, and the denial of canonicity to certain books of the Apocrypha, by *Luther's whelps*, are treated as proofs of desperation. These books are said to refute most clearly objections to the patronage of angels, free-will, the faithful departed from life, and the intercession of saints. 2. Any other than a literal interpretation of our Lord's words at the Last Supper, is branded with fraud and rashness. Luther is represented as anxious to become a Zuinglian, but unable to escape from the plain text of Scripture, an unwilling homage to the truth, like that of the devils, who cried out that Jesus was the Son of God. 3. The Church, Campion says, is a word that makes his opponents turn pale, and he rhetorically, but indistinctly, and jejunely, identifies it with the Papacy. 4. English professions of respect for the first four general councils would, he maintains, if sincere, secure *highest honour to the bishop of the first see, that is, to Peter;* acknowledgement of the unbloody sacrifice on the altar; invocation of saints; the restraint of wifish apostates (*mulierosos apostatas*,) from wicked cohabitation, and public incest; and many other things not specified. 5. The Fathers, he pronounces as much their own, as *Gregory XIII. himself most loving father of the Church's sons*, and the pseudo-Dionysius, with other such authorities, are summoned to make his assertion good. 6. He declaims against Protestant professions of adhering to the Fathers, so long as these adhere to Scripture, as delusive, the Fathers, properly interpreted, supplying authorities for the whole Romish creed. 7. Ecclesiastical history, he insists, is wholly that of Romanism; and he demands of those who think otherwise, when Romanism began? 8. Paradoxes, he pronounces to be the various questions mooted among Protestant divines, upon predestination, the Godhead, and other subtle points. 9. Sophisms charged are fighting with shadows, strife about words, equivocation, and arguing in a circle. 10. Witnesses of all kinds form a rhetorical chapter, of which the drift is to claim every thing venerable or Christian for Popery.

[2] DODD. ii. 138. The book was not, however, in every body's hands, for Bishop Aylmer vainly sought for a copy of it, soon after its

---

appearance. (STRYPE. *Aylmer*. 32.) "A tangled dell, in the neighbourhood of Stonor Park, near Henley on Thames, is still shown, in which Campian wrote his *Decem Rationes*, and to which books and food were carried by stealth." (BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* iii. 193.) Persons contrived to have a press provided for the printing of Romish books: which was seized.—MOORE. 86.

[1] "To Campion's *Reasons* Whitaker gave a solid answer." (CAMBDEN. 477.) Whitaker, like Campion, wrote in Latin, and Bishop Aylmer was not pleased to hear that some persons were translating his work, thinking it undesirable to heat the popular mind with controversy. Dawson published a translation of it in 1732. Another of Campion's respondents was Humphrey, and he thus characterises the work. "De hisce omnibus Campiani *Rationibus*, dici potest ex Hieronymo, *In quibus nulla sit vis argumentorum, sed tantum orationis facies, exquisitis hic inde coloribus pigmentata.*"—*Ad Epist. Camp. Resp.*

[2] "Are you such a stranger, or so little versed in the writings of the ancient Fathers, as not to know that these books were of old left out of the Canon?—Why should we not strike 'em out? For, says St. Jerome, they are not in the Canon.—If you don't know these testimonies from antiquity, Campion, you are a mere *Tyro*, a novice in the cause; in which yet you would fain pass for an old champion." (WHITAKER'S *Answer to Edm. Campion.* Engl. transl. 47, 48, 49.) Referring Campion to Erasmus and Valla, respecting the *Double Hierarchy of Dionysius*, Whitaker says, "You cannot justly be so angry with Luther and Causseus, if they treated a *counterfeit* author somewhat roughly." (*Ib.* 112.) The castigation then proceeds to the spurious epistles of Ignatius, and does not end without more instances of Campion's incompetence; for it was, probably, not disingenousness.

futation of his *Answer*[1]. The Romish party laid, indeed, very great stress upon Campion's challenges. That unfortunate scholar himself fancied that his boldness had rendered the Protestants furious[2]; and he still is thought not greatly mistaken[3].

Persons and Campion met once more, after the last anxious evening of their London residence. The former had an opportunity of contriving an interview with his friend, at Uxbridge, and there the two spent Michaelmas-day together[4]. Desire for their apprehension was augmented by the popular clamour against Elizabeth's encouragement to the duke of Anjou's matrimonial aims. People thought their queen bewitched by this gay young Frenchman, into a disposition to surrender the Reformation, and every report of Campion's challenges was taken as confirmation of these gloomy forebodings. In vindication of her constancy, an active search was made for the unhappy Jesuit[5]. But he eluded pursuit during almost thirteen months[1], consumed in a long circuit of reconciling visits at the houses of wealthy Romanists. Not only were the families of such persons trained in habits of concealing the clandestine arrival of a priest, but also the residences themselves were studiously constructed for baffling his pursuers. Cavities were designedly left under roofs, or stairs, or between walls, or in any other suitable spot, which trusty workmen fitted-up, at night, as secret cells for concealing both a priest and the requisites for mass[2]. Of such recesses even the servants generally knew nothing. The last place that received Campion as a guest, was an ancient house of this kind, moated, and approached by a drawbridge, at Lyfford, in Berkshire, eight miles from Oxford[3]. It was the residence of Edward Yates, a gentleman who had eight nuns as inmates, conclusive evidence of strong Romish attachments[4]. Among persons, acquainted in the family, was George Elliot, who had served some opulent Romanists in menial capacities, and who made profession of their creed[5]. This man, now passed into very different service,

---

[1] DODD. ii. 141. "This man made the Romish cause still worse; his book being full of invectives, long digressions, and little argument to the purpose. However, our professor" (Whitaker) "thought fit to return an answer, full of learning and sound reasoning, and adding strength to the cause which he had defended before." (DAWSON'S *Prefatory Account of Campion and Whitaker.* 17.) Whitaker's "works and his worth gained him renown throughout Europe; so that Cardinal Bellarmine, the champion of Popery, though often foiled by his pen, honoured his picture with a place in his library, and said, he was the most learned heretic he had ever read."—CHURTON'S *Life of Nowell.* 328.

[2] "Father Campion himself says, that the publication of it put the adversaries of the Catholics into a fury."—BUTLER. iii. 204.

[3] "The bold tone of this letter gave considerable offence, which was greatly increased by the publication of another tract by the same writer, enumerating ten reasons on which he founded his hope of victory in the proposed dispute before the universities."—LINGARD. viii. 174.

[4] BARTOLI. 125.

[5] "During his stay here" (the duke of Anjou's) "the Queen, to take away the fear which had possessed many men's minds, that religion would be altered, and Popery tolerated, being overcome by importunate intreaties, permitted that Edm. Campion aforesaid, of

---

the society of Jesus, Ralph Sherwin, Luke Kirby, and Alex. Briant, priests, should be arraigned." (CAMBDEN. 487.) "Per id enim tempus, Alensonius, Galliæ regis frater, Elizabethæ nuptius ambiens, in Anglia diversabatur."—MOORE. 90.

[1] BRIDGEWATER. 54. This calculation, of course, takes in the time spent in and about London.

[2] "His inter parietum commissuras, aut tectorum vacuitates, aut scalarum obscuritates, cavearumve densitatem, ab fidis nocturnisque operariis, vix quoque domesticorum conscio, fabricatis, et sacra supellex conditur, et sacris operantium salus tuto plerumque committitur, dum in ampla domo quo quave ad indagandum eatur, acutissimus quisque inquisitor ignarus est."—MOORE. 88.

[3] "Ben serrato di mura, circuito di fosse, col ponte levatorio, tutto cosa all' antica."—BARTOLI. 149.

[4] *Ibid.* 148.

[5] "Et quidem Georgius ille famulus olim fuerat D. Thomæ Roperi; deinde vero mensibus ab hinc aliquot fœminæ cuidam nobili, quam viduam post se reliquerat D. Wilhelmus Petri, regius dum viveret, secretarius, inservierat. In quorum familiis quamdiu

and apprehensive of a capital prosecution, was told, one day, by Mr. Yates's cook, that Campion was in the house[1]. He lost no time in turning this information to account, and in order to secure the prize, he availed himself of his privilege as an acquaintance and a Romanist, to attend mass. The service being over, Campion preached upon the text, *O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killest the prophets and stonest them which are sent unto thee, &c.*[2], but, seemingly, before he had concluded, an alarm was given, that officers of justice, well attended, were at hand[3]. The preacher made instantly for his hiding-place, and so effectual were its means of concealment, that the search appeared all but hopeless, when strenuous blows with a mallet against a suspicious portion of wall[4], discovered a small chamber, in which were Campion[5], with two other priests, Ford and Collington[6]. They seem to have confessed and absolved each other, then to have repeated the third petition in the Lord's Prayer, absurdly adding to it invocations of St. John the Baptist[7]. After a detention

---

versatus est, Catholico more ac ritu se gessit; sed cum haud ita dudum cædem perpetrasset, eamque ob causam de vita periclitaretur, metu perculsus, in clientelam se contulit unius ex eorum numero, quorum in regno prima habetur auctoritas. Quam, ut insigni aliquo obsequio se devinciret, spopondit se Edmundum Campianum ei in manus traditurum." (BRIDGEWATER. 54.) Bartoli says of him, probably with justice, that he was "hora Cattolico, hora quel tutt' altro che piu gli tornasse ad utile."—146.

[1] BRIDGEWATER. 54.

[2] St. Matt. xxiii. 37.

[3] July 17. LINGARD. viii. 175. *Execution of Justice.* 19. A list of houses to which Campion had been, may be seen in STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. pt. 2. pp. 358, 359, 360.

[4] MOORE. 88.

[5] "Disguised like a Royster."—*Exec. Just. ut supra.*

[6] BRIDGEWATER. 55.

[7] "Per salutaris igitur pœnitentiæ sacramentum ubi omnem offensam expiassent, hanc sibi mutuo in piam satisfactionem, pro temporis opportunitate, pœnam injunxerunt, ut quisque tertio salu berrima illa ex Oratione Dominica deprompta verba, *Fiat voluntas tua*, recitaret; simulque D. Joannis Baptistæ auxilium in tam præsenti periculo tertio imploraret:

of two days in custody of the sheriff, they were sent towards London. The first part of their journey appears to have been attended by no circumstances of peculiar hardship, many of the gentry shewing great interest in their fate, and freely entering into conversation with them. But severe miseries began, after the halt of a night and part of the preceding day, at Colnbrook. They were paraded all through Middlesex and London to the Tower[1], with legs tied under the bellies of horses, and faces to the tails, gazing-stocks for vulgar curiosity, scorn, and rage. To render the principal prisoner's part in this ignominious pageant more intolerable, *Campion, the seditious Jesuit,* was ticketed on his hat[2]. Few sights could be more delightful to a popalace, whose hatred of Popery had become extreme. Persons, though diligently sought, eluded inquiry, and continued in England several months longer[3]. But his entertainers, feeling the danger

---

hunc enim gloriosissimum Christi præcursorem, cultu atque veneratione singulari prosecuti sunt, ideoque hunc maxime invocarunt, quod P. Edmundus se illius precibus, cum Dorobernium appulisset, adversariorum manibus ereptum existimaret."—*Ibid.*

[1] July 22.—Diarium Rerum Gestarum in Tur. Lond. ad calcem. SAND. *De Schism. Angl.*

[2] BRIDGEWATER. 56. MOORE. 89.

[3] "Persons continued for some months to brave the danger which menaced him: but at length, at the urgent request of his friends, both for their security and his own, he retired beyond the sea." (LINGARD. viii. 175.) The following account of this remarkable man is given in his own words, by Mr. Butler, from a *Manifestation of the Great Folly and Bad Spirit of certayne in England, calling themselves Secular Priests.* 4to. 1602. He was "born in the parish of Stowey, in Somersetshire, in the year 1546, one year before King Henry died; to which parish there came soon after out of Devonshire, to be vicar there, John Hayward, a virtuous good priest, that had been canon regular before, and this man lived there for thirty years together, until after Father Persons's departure out of England, who having been his master in the Latin tongue, and liking his forwardness in learning, did ever afterwards bear a special affection towards him. His parents were right honest people, and of the most substantial of their

of such a guest, besought him to decline the honour of martyrdom[1]. At length, he had a good opportunity of yielding to their persuasions, and withdrew to the continent.

The mental sufferings of a prisoner would not satisfy that cruel, vindictive, half-reflecting age. It easily found reasons for torturing his frame. Campion had scarcely time to look around his gloomy lodging, when dragged for interrogation before the rack. Full information chiefly was required as to places and persons, visited in his late ill-omened mission. He seems to have been mute, and was, accordingly, stretched upon the accursed engine. The inhuman, illegal, illusory work stopped short of any violent extremity, and probably the wretched sufferer was released with spirit unsubdued. His nerves, it is plain, were dreadfully shattered, and under a repetition of this barbarity, nature broke down. The poor Jesuit's agony wrested from him various particulars that his torturers demanded. Thus again, did he escape with-

---

degree among their neighbours, while they lived; and his father was reconciled to the church by Mr. Bryant, the martyr; and his mother, a grave and virtuous matron, living divers years, and dying in flight out of her country, for her conscience." (*Hist. Mem.* iii. 167.) The principal object of this account is evidently to wipe away the stigma upon the writer's birth by placing Hayward's arrival in his native parish soon *after* it, and by eulogising both *his* character and his own mother's. Other objections urged by his enemies are left untouched, and even these are met by mere assertions, which are contradicted by counter assertions of contemporaries.

[1] "Primeramente il continuo andar che di lui facevano, con incredibil solecitudine, in cerca i commessarii con braccio regio, e le sagacissime spie, cercandone dentro la città, e di fuori ne' palagi villeschi, ordinaria abitatione de' nobili, riuscia a Cattolici una intolerabile infestatione; e a sacerdoti una gran giunta di ragionevol timore; trovandosi spesse volte di mezza notte assaliti, e sorpresi essi, per altro non saputi, nè cerchi, se non solo in quanto si cercava il P. Personio: e già ve n'era qualche sentore di scontentezza, e di rammarichi, onde giusta fu acquettarlo, col rendersi, e sottrarsi prima che procedesse piu avanti."—BARTOLI. 238.

out any personal injury of serious importance. He was able to walk from the dreadful chamber, without assistance, to write and subscribe his confessions: to use, in fact, every member of his body[1]. Fear and horror were the real screws that wrung him. Such were the times, that even religious men could call this, favourable usage, and brand Romish complaints of it as a needless outcry, where, in truth, nobody was hurt[2]. This, and other such miserable scenes, are foul blots upon Protestantism, but no especial discredit. Both foreign and domestic practice lent authority to examination by torture. The Inquisition steadily maintained it, in defiance of increasing civilization and humanity. Nor did it wholly cease to disgrace the more polished nations until that execrable tribunal was no more. But however countenanced, Elizabeth's government was loudly censured for its barbarities in the Tower, especially abroad. Stung by these reproaches, it published a demi-official vindication, in 1583. This denies, altogether, prevailing reports both as to mode and severity of torture actually employed. It asserts, that none were questioned upon any point purely theological, but only as to persons visited, plots devised, political discourse, opinion and teaching upon the deposing power. Nor, it is added, were any thus interrogated, unless their guilt had been previously pretty well ascertained; nor until a positive refusal to explain, although commanded upon allegiance. Without sufficient evidence of its untruth, a solemn asseveration of ignorance or forgetfulness was accepted. Nor lastly, was

---

[1] The object of his racking was to extort a confession of the places "where he had been conversant since his repair into the realm. Concerning his racking, Master Lieutenant being present," (at the disputation,) "said that he had no cause to complain of racking, who had rather seen than felt the rack; and admonished him to use good speach that he gave not cause to be used with more severity. For although, said he, you were put to the rack, yet notwithstanding, you were so favourably used therein, as being taken off, you could and did presently go to your lodging without any help, and use your hands in writing, and all other parts of your body." (*A True Report of the Disputation, or rather Private Conference, had in the Tower of London, with Ed. Campion, Jesuit, the last of August*, 1581. *Published by Authority.* Lond. 1583.) The correctness of this account is evident from Allen. "Bis nuper Campianus, Jesuita, tortus est equuleo. Quis adversariorum non pernegabat? Tandem res innotuit, Campiano ipso in turba hominum hoc profitente. At ludus erat; inquiunt adversarii; non serio, sed joco fere torquebatur. Eodem modo de aliis prius tortis luserant. Tam delectabile est facetis hominibus, de miserorum cruciatibus jocos facere." (*De Persec. Angl.* 38.) The first two rackings of Campion, and some other unhappy victims, are also spoken of as *secret*, by Rishton, the Tower Diarist. "Campianus bis *clam* equuleo tortus, una cum presbyteris concaptivis, et laicis Catholicis." From *clam*, probably, nothing more is to be inferred, than that the torture was used with comparative mildness. The information extracted in this infamous way, was given, we are told, Campion said on the scaffold, under an engagement upon oath, that his harbourers should not be molested. It is, however, certain that many of them were molested. Some were fined and imprisoned. The unhappy victim bitterly regretted his weakness in these disclosures.—LINGARD. viii. 176. note.

[2] "In very trueth, there was no one of them so racked, but that, howsoever their minds seemed to yeelde to the feare of paine, they were yet worse afraied then hurt. For the very next Sabaoth day, though to the churchwarde they must be drawen, or driven, or carried, betweene two men, like obstinate beares to a stake; yet

could they after the sermon, walke home upon their own legges stoutly enough and strongly, as other folks. This is indeed to straine at a gnat, and swallow up a camell, to complayne of justice mercifully and necessarily used to two or three, and yourselves with all horrible tormentes to destroy great cities, and attempt the desolation of whole kingdoms." (*A Replie to a Censure written against the two Answeres to a Jesuite's seditious Pamphlet.* By William Charke, Lond. 1581.) This learned Puritan, whose humanity does not shew here to much advantage, speaks of the racking as having occurred six or seven weeks before. The Tower Diarist complains of being taken to hear Protestant, or rather controversial sermons, as a grievance. It seems, however, that the prisoners sometimes interrupted the preacher, and hooted him after sermon. The same age that could outrage the feelings of defenceless men by dragging them to hear intentional attacks, would naturally betray these very men into such indecencies, and into the absurdity of requiring absolute force for their conveyance to church.

torture ever used, before an intimidating array of preparation, accompanied by earnest appeals to reason and conscience, had long been tried in vain[1]. Exaggeration was, no doubt, imputable to the wretched sufferers, and their indignant friends. But overdone complaints in such a case, were natural and excusable. Abuse of power is always infamous.

As a party may rack that cannot confute, it was thought advisable to try the strength of Campion in the way that he had himself so publicly desired. On the last day of August, he was brought into the Tower chapel with his fellow-prisoners, to meet Alexander Nowell, dean of St. Paul's, and William Day, dean of Windsor. The two dignitaries indiscreetly began, as if to recriminate under consciousness of cruelty, by adverting to the Marian times, and asserting that none since had been executed for religion. Campion immediately pronounced himself an example of very severe personal suffering for religion, having been twice upon the rack. This brought forward the lieutenant of the Tower, who maintained that very little severity had been used, a fact, which, physically speaking, was evidently undeniable[1]. The *Ten Reasons* then came under discussion. The prisoner was first charged with misrepresenting Protestants as to the rejection of St. James's epistle, on

---

[1] A Declaration of the Favourable Dealing of her Majesties Commissioners appointed for the Examination of Certaine Traitours, and of Tortures unjustly reported to be done upon them for Matters of Religion, 1583. *Harleian Miscellany*. Lond. 1745. iii. 537.

[1] "He himself by his loud speeches, and bold, and busy gestures, shewed no token of any either sickness or weakness; neither did himself then complain of those difficulties which the pamphleters have so diligently and largely noted sithence."—*A Brief Recital of certain Untruths scattered in the Pamphlets and Libels of the Papists concerning the former Conferences: with a Short Answer to the same.*

Luther's authority; there being really neither such rejection, nor such authority. To prove the latter case, he was shewn a printed book, and could only answer that it was not the right edition. He was told, and no doubt, honestly, though incorrectly, that all editions here were alike[1]. Other points were subsequently debated, and, as his opponents thought, very little to Campion's advantage. The two deans were chiefly bent upon discrediting him, or, as they said, "reclaiming him," by a merciless exposure of his numerous inaccuracies. These they treated as imputations upon veracity, though really, perhaps, mere slips of hasty writing, sanguine temperament, and superficial information. But be their cause what it may, such errors cannot be detected without humiliating any man, and in the afternoon Campion confronted his opponents with an air of much greater modesty than he had worn in the morning. The topics, too, were more manageable, chiefly turning upon justification: and, as usual upon such questions, the disputants were found, at length, very much of the same opinion[1]. Thus a colour was given for representing Campion as departing completely master of the field: and the two deans were called-upon to lower the strains of Romish triumph, by publishing their own account of the conference. Three other disputations followed, in which the celebrated Jesuit argued with new opponents[2]. Upon the whole, he disappointed expectation. Protestants expressly say so[3]. Romanists tacitly admit it, by dwelling upon the barbarian tortures that he had undergone, and his want of books[4]. No common man could have stood his ground, as he did, under such disadvantages.

---

[1] "It has lately been observed, that Luther, in his German preface to his first edition of the Bible, 1525, intimated that the Epistle of St. James ought to be struck out of the canon; but the passage was omitted in 1526, and all subsequent editions." (CHURTON'S *Nowell.* 274. note.) Campion, probably, heard of the passage, as it originally stood, while abroad, and might have given himself no farther trouble about the matter, though represented as aware of alterations in different editions of controversial works. To his residence in Bohemia may be attributable his more than usual violence about Luther. It is like a neighbourhood antipathy. The two deans, probably, knew nothing of Luther's first edition. The case is thus stated by a friendly hand. "Quia scripta Lutheri, quibus Angli utuntur, a posterioribus sectariis recognita, iterumque excusa, discrepant ab iis, quæ primum edita fuerant, allato codice, et loco, quem Edmundus quærebat, non invento, mirum quam adversarii magnifice triumpharint. Quibus ille solummodo respondit, recentiores dogmatistas sententiam de qua quæstio erat, inde sustulisse, ut multas alias ex Lutheri et Calvini scriptis, quòd eas suæ sectæ minus congruere intelligerent; idque facile convinci posse ex iis exemplaribus, quæ primo omnium in Germania prodiissent."—BRIDGEWATER. 59.

To such acceptance of his own challenges, there could be no objection. But it was disgracefully deemed advisable to stretch him again upon the rack. When overcome before, under its atrocious machinery, he seems to have let something fall that gave hope of important disclosures. Such a report, at least, alarmed his friends out of doors, and in a letter to make them easy, he declared himself to have had no more extorted from him than names of persons and places. As to secrets, in his intercourse with individuals, he had revealed none, nor ever would, "come rack, come rope." In fact, he denied himself to have been entrusted with any, save the sins of his penitents, of which he was depositary under the seal of confession, which he certainly would not break[1]. It was, however, excusable enough to disbelieve such protestations. He never was interrogated respecting the pope's execrable assumptions of political power, without sullenness, or equivocation. Hence no reliance could be placed either on his own loyalty, or on his religious discretion, when frittering down the responsibility of others, under the pestilent process of confession. But although his answers were evidently undeserving of any credit, nothing could excuse the barbarity of his treatment. He was now tortured with extreme severity[2], and continued seriously disabled by it, during the short remainder of his life.

---

[1] "The favourers of Campion, in various pamphlets, printed and manuscript, boasted that the Protestants, in this dispute, *were quite confounded*, and that the *Catholics did get the goal*."—CHURTON'S *Nowell*. 276.

[2] "On two of these days, the disputants were Dr. Fulke, master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, author of several tracts against Popery, and Dr. Goad, provost of King's College: and on the last day, Dr. Walker, archdeacon of Essex, and Mr. William Charke. These conferences were collected from the notes of several who wrote there, by John Field. But it is not necessary to notice them, further than to say, that these latter disputants, particularly Fulke and Goad, being Puritanically inclined, and leaning to Calvin's notions, afforded Campion, on one or two points, an advantage which his cause did not give him over the real principles of the English Church."—*Ib.* 278.

[3] "Afterwards being brought forth to dispute, he scarcely answered the expectation raised of him."—CAMBDEN. 477.

[4] "Nulla enim recordor cessisse adversarios disceptandi certamina, præter hæc quæ dixi, excepta solum recenti disputatione, quem Edmundo Campiano, Jesuita incarcerato, bis torto, libris destituto, et rebus omnibus imparatissimo, præterquam causa et voluntate, sunt largiti. Cujus profecto disputationis iniquissima multa, his in partibus, narrantur, ipsis etiam testibus qui interfuerunt, quorum forsan nonnulla vix hominibus doctis credibilia viderentur, nisi superiorum temporum exemplis admoniti, quidvis fere suspicari de hominum timidorum iniquitate cogeremur."—ALLEN. *De Persec. Angl.* 60.

Elizabeth complained of prosecuting Campion and others in custody, as a hardship imposed by her situation, which she would gladly have escaped[1]. The ministry, however, pleaded state-necessity, and her feelings gave way. The unfortunate Jesuit, with six other ecclesiastics, and one layman, were arraigned under the statute of Edward III. before the court of Queen's Bench[2]. They were charged with conspiring abroad to murder their sovereign, overthrow the established religion, and subvert the state: traitorous purposes that they had since pursued in their native country. In pleading not guilty, poor Campion afforded ocular testimony to atrocious usage lately undergone, by his inability to raise his hand so high as was customary[3]. After an interval of six days, the prisoners were again brought into court at Westminster, for a formal trial[4]. This has generally been considered unfair and insufficient; being liable, among other objections, to the fatal one of connecting parties together, who really seem, in some instances, to have known little or nothing of each other[1]. Perhaps, one of the strongest presumptions against Campion, was the seizure of treasonable papers in houses which he had visited[2]. He naturally and reasonably objected, that let these documents be what they might, no evidence had connected him with them. But such a defence, though a legal acquittal, is not morally one, under suspicious circumstances. In that situation, the prisoner evidently stood. He had come directly from a hostile foreigner, then actually invading Ireland, and pretending to a power of wresting from the queen, her English sceptre also. It does not appear, that this alien enemy's insidious faculty to tolerate Elizabeth *as matters stood,* was known in court. It was discovered after the trial[3]. But, probably, all the prisoners knew it, and such information places their integrity in a very questionable light. They did not, however, allow any doubt as to their unfitness to remain at large in England. It might be illegal, and unjust, to interrogate accused persons against themselves. But such was then the usage of England, as it still is of foreign countries. These unfortunate persons were interrogated upon the pope's iniquitous political assumptions, and every appearance of straight-forward manliness was gone at once[1]. They could evade, equi-

---

[1] Lingard. viii. 176.

[2] Oct. 31. (*Diar. rer. gest. in Turri Lond.*) The continuator of Sanders says, "quæstioni ter aut quater ad luxationem ac quassationem omnium membrorum subjicitur." (*De Schism. Angl.* 345.) Dr. Lingard (*ut supra*) says, "Campian was twice more stretched on the rack: he was kept on that engine of torture, till it was thought he had expired." This latter clause appears founded on a passage of Allen's (*De Pers. Angl.* 82.), which asserts of Campion and others, "et pene ad mortem ipsam equuleo torserant." The former clause, most likely, comes from the loose "ter aut quater." The Tower Diarist, however, speaks exactly, and he makes the case out bad enough.

---

[1] CAMBDEN. 487.

[2] Nov. 14.—*Diar. rer. gest. in Turri Lond.*

[3] "Both his arms, writes a person present at his trial, being pitifully benumbed by his often cruel racking before, and having them wrapped in a fur cuff, he was not able to lift his hand so high as the rest did, and was required of him: but one of his companions kissing his hands so abused for the confession of Christ, took off his cuff, and so lifted up his arm as high as he could, and he pleaded *Not Guilty*, as the rest did." (BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* i. 187.) Elizabeth subsequently ordered torture to be discontinued.—HALLAM. *Const. Hist.* i. 205.

[4] Nov. 20. (*Diar. rer. gest. in Turri Lond.*) "Nothing that I have read affords the slightest proof of Campion's concern in treasonable practices, though his connections, and profession as a Jesuit, render it by no means unlikely. If we may confide in the published trial, the prosecution was as unfairly conducted, and supported by as slender evidence, as any, perhaps, which can be found in our books. But as this account, wherein Campion's language is full of a dignified eloquence, rather seems to have been compiled by a partial hand, its faithfulness may not be above suspicion."—HALLAM. *Const. Hist.* i. 198.

---

[1] "Some had not even seen each other before they met at the bar. Before judgment was pronounced, Lancaster, a Protestant barrister, rose and made oath, that Colleton, one of the number, had consulted him in his chambers in London, on the very day in which he was charged with having conspired at Rheims. Colleton was remanded."—LINGARD. viii. 178, 179.

[2] "The clerk then produced certain oaths to be ministered to the people, for renouncing obedience to her Majesty, and swearing allegiance to the Pope; which papers were found in houses in which Campion had lurked. It does not appear, however, that any evidence was offered, either respecting the discovery of these papers, or the places in which they were said to have been found. Campion observed that there was no proof that he had any concern in these papers, that many other persons besides himself had frequented the houses in which he was said to have lurked; so that there was nothing which brought the charge home to himself. As for administering an oath of any kind, he declared, that he would not commit an offence so opposite to his profession for all the substance and treasure in the world."—BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* i. 190.

[3] "Taken about one of their complices, immediately after Campian's death." (*Exec. of Just.* 19.) The secresy used about this document makes it seem likely that those who obtained and imported it had not much thought of it as a mitigation. Allen put that colour upon it after its discovery, and loud complaints of its perfidious character. Watson treats it as a renewal, therefore an aggravation rather than a mitigation. "Now whilst these practices were in

---

hand in Ireland, Gregory XIII. reneweth the said bull of *Pius Quintus*, and denounceth her Majesty to be excommunicated, with intimation of all other particulars in the former bull mentioned; which was procured, we doubt not, by surreption: the false Jesuits, our countrymen, daring to attempt anything, by untrue suggestions, and lewd surmises, that may serve their turns."—*Important Considerations.* 62.

[1] "The jealousie also of the state was much increased by Mr. Sherwin's answers upon his examination, above eight months before the apprehension of Mr. Campion. For being asked whether the Queen was his lawful sovereign, notwithstanding any sentence of the Pope, he prayed that no such question might be demanded of him, and would not further thereunto answer. Two or three other questions much to the same effect, were likewise propounded unto him, which he also refused to answer. Matters now sorting on this fashion, there was a greater restraint of Catholics than at any time before. Many both priests and gentlemen were sent into the Isle of Ely, and other places, there to be more safely kept and looked-unto. In July, Mr. Campion and other priests were apprehended: whose answers, upon their examinations, agreeing in effect, with Mr. Sherwin's before-mentioned, did greatly incense the state. For amongst other questions that were propounded unto them, *viz.* If the Pope do, by his bull or sentence, pronounce her Majesty to be deprived, and no lawful queen, and her subjects to be discharged of their allegiance and obedience unto her; and after, the Pope, or any other by his appointment and authority, do invade this realm: which part would you take, or which part ought a good subject of England to take? Some answered, that when the case should happen, they would take counsel what were best for them to do: another, that when that case should happen, he would answer, and not before: another, that for the present, he was not resolved what to do in such a case; another, that when the case happeneth, then he will answer: another, that if such deprivation and in-

vocate, plead law; in fine, could do any thing rather than disclaim the insufferable pretensions of an Italian priest. But he was the invader of Ireland, he had pretended to make a kingdom of it for the fruit of his own shame, or give it to somebody more likely to conquer it; he was openly practising to dethrone Elizabeth, and set-up some rival, or foreigner, who might pillage wealthy Protestants, and drive poor ones again into the fires of Smithfield[1].

---

vasion should be made for any matter of his faith, he thinketh he were then bound to take part with the pope.

"Now, what king in the world, being in doubt to be invaded by his enemies, and fearing that some of his own subjects were by indirect means drawn rather to adhere unto them than to himself, would not make the best tryal of them he could for his better satisfaction whom he might trust-to? In which tryal, if he found any, that either should make doubtful answers, or peremptorily affirm, that, as the case stood betwixt him and his enemies, they would leave him their prince, and take part with them: might he not justly repute them for traitors, and deal with them accordingly? Sure we are, that no king or prince in Christendom would like, or tolerate any such subjects within their dominions, if possibly they could be rid of them." (*Important Considerations.* 66, 68, 69.)

Being shewn certain seditious passages from Sanders, Bristow, and Allen, Campion said, "that he meddleth neither to, nor fro." As to the deposition, he said, "that this question dependeth upon the fact of Pius V. whereof he is not to judge, and therefore, refuseth to answer any further." Briant was content to take Elizabeth for his sovereign, but he would not affirm her sovereignty lawful, or that she ought to be obeyed, if the pope commanded the contrary. That question he pronounced too high and dangerous for him to answer. As to the pope's power of releasing from obedience to the queen, he professed himself ignorant. Sherwin refused to answer as to the lawfulness of the pope's deposition, and some other such questions. (*A Particular Declaration or Testimony of the Undutifull and Traiterous Affection borne agaynst her Majestie, by Edmund Campion, Jesuit, and other condemned Priestes. Published by Authority.* Lond. 1582.)

"*Phi.* Wee bee not judges betweene the Pope and the Queene. *Theo.* So said Campion at the King's bench."—Bishop Bilson's *True Difference betweene Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion.* p. 111.

[1] "Many of our affections were knit to the Spaniard, and for our obedience to the Pope, we do all profess it. The attempts both of the Pope and Spaniard failing in England, his Holiness, as a temporal prince, displayed his banner

It was this which ensured condemnation to these miserable prisoners, and which brands them indelibly as dangerous political incendiaries, at best.

They might still have saved their lives by renouncing the pope's anti-christian and anti-social pretensions[1]. Bosgrave, a Jesuit, Rishton, a secular priest, and Orton, a layman, made this amends to outraged religion and common sense. The rest were too deeply smitten by the leprosy caught abroad. Equally disgusted and grieved by this obstinacy, some of the more serious Romanists were now at a loss to acquit them of treasonable designs[2]. Nor would rational and candid men, generally, have found fault, if the whole had been immediately transported, under threat of execution, on a stealthy return. Unhappily, their's was not the age for such mild counsels. Campion, Sherwin, who came from Rome, and Briant, from Rheims, were selected at

---

in Ireland. The plot was to deprive her Highness first from that kingdom, if they could, and then by degrees to depose her from this. How many men of our calling were addicted to these courses, the state knew not. In which case, the premises discreetly considered, there is no king or prince in the world, disgusting the see of Rome, and having either force or metal in him, that would have endured us, if possibly he could have been revenged, but rather, as we think, have utterly rooted us out of his territories, as traitors and rebels both to him and his country. And therefore, we may rejoice unfeignedly that God hath blessed this kingdom with so gracious and merciful a sovereign, who hath not dealt in this sort with us. Assuredly, if she were a Catholic, she might be be accounted the mirror of the world."—*Important Considerations*. 64.

[1] "Campion, after he was condemned, being asked, first, Whether Queen Elizabeth was a right and lawful queen? refused to answer: then, Whether he would take part with the Queen, or the Pope, if he should send forces against the Queen? he openly professed and testified under his hand, that he would stand for the Pope."—CAMBDEN. 487.

[2] "They answered, some of 'em so ambiguously, some so resolutely, and some by prevarication and silence, shifting off the questions, in such a manner that divers ingenuous Catholics began to suspect they were engaged in traitorous designs."—*Ibid.*

once to undergo the revengeful, revolting, and brutalising penalties of treason. They were dragged, as usual, on sledges, from the Tower to Tyburn, Campion by himself, his unfortunate friends together. The dying Jesuit trode the fatal ladder with intrepid step, and with neck now fixed within the noose, he began, *We are made a spectacle to God, to angels, and to men.* Immediately, the sheriff interrupted him, suffering him only to beseech the people, that as they watched his dying struggles, they would repeat the Creed, thus making that profession for him which he could no longer make himself. The words were hardly uttered when his feet were thrust off the ladder[1]. Charles Howard, lord admiral, would not suffer him to be cut down until dead[2]. The sickening butchery prescribed by law was then practised on his body, the two remaining victims looking-on. It was thought, probably, that such horrors would frighten them into a renunciation of their politics. But they displayed no emotion. Having completed this first mutilation, the executioner laid his bloody hands on the next unfortunate, brutally saying, *Come, Sherwin, take your earnings.* As the poor priest mildly kissed the wretch's gory fingers, the crowd shouted admiration, insisting that the sufferer should say what he desired. He mounted the ladder, made a powerful address[3] of unknown purport, and then himself inserted his neck in the noose, greeted on every side, with *Good Sherwin, the Lord God receive thy good soul.* Before suspension, Briant, a very handsome young man of eight and twenty, made a short profession of his faith, and protested innocence not only of treasonable deeds, but even of treasonable thoughts[1]. The crowd that gazed upon this pitiable, savage sight, was immense, and among it were several persons of quality[2].

---

[1] Dec. 1. (ALLEN. *De Persec. Angl.* 87.) "He was required to ask forgiveness of the Queen. He meekly answered, *Wherein have I offended her? In this I am innocent. This is my last breath: in this give me credit. I have and I do pray for her.* Lord Charles Howard asked him for which queen he prayed? whether for Elizabeth, the Queen? Campion replied, *Yes: for Elizabeth, your queen, and my queen.* (BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* i. 191.) Allen's account, however, has been followed as more probable. No doubt, it came from good authority.

[2] BARTOLI. 214.

[3] "Efficacissiman cohortationem ad populum habuit."—ALLEN. *ubi supra.*

On the day following that of Campion's trial, seven more prisoners were convicted of the same offences[3]. Both prosecutions were strictly defensive measures. Execution under them was plainly proved by the first experiment, no less impolitic than cruel. It enlisted sympathy and admiration on the side of parties clearly in the wrong. But alarmed and irritated rulers do not readily discern such a truth, while times continue rude. The surviving convicts, accordingly, being found intractable, first three[4], then four of them, suffered as traitors, at Tyburn[5]. These repeated butcheries of scholarly, virtuous, amiable, self-devoted clergymen, threw great odium on the government. A large portion of the English public, no doubt, approved. Many dreaded treasonable movements, many had been led by Puritanical invectives, to consider Popery of itself a capital crime, and some, probably, had brought a resentful feeling from the Marian times, which pressed heavily upon lower life. But foreigners were under no such influences, and Allen was not slow in moving their pity and indignation, by raising a loud shout of persecution against Elizabeth, and her ministers. Even before this could re-echo through the continent, pains were taken to extend a favourable view of late severities. One pamphlet from authority defended the use of torture, and denied any excess in its recent employment[1]. Another exhibited extracts from Sanders and Bristow, with evidence that the unhappy men, lately condemned, really held such criminal principles[2]. Others, again, detailed Campion's proceedings, and supplied particulars of his death. From this latter, the unhappy Jesuit appears to have denied, at Tyburn, any other treason than his religion. On this he was urged with offence against the queen, which he met by acknowledging her as his lawful sovereign. But he then hesitated, and became confused. Probably, this alteration in his manner, lost him the opportunity, for which he was evidently prepared, of making a formal address from the ladder. It must have seemed not unlikely, that in case of his regaining complete self-possession, he might say something far from agreeable to the ruling powers. In this pamphlet, he is represented as a vain, ready, clever, specious man; a character sufficiently confirmed by existing evidence[3]. Allen grappled immediately with all the apologies for his country's treatment of the reconciling priests, in an eloquent and feeling, but unfair Latin pamphlet. *On the English Persecution*[1]. This was promptly, though not expressly, answered in the *English Justice*, which came, it is believed, from Burghley, and has the plain, solid character, to be expected from such a paternity[2]. Allen, however, did not leave it in undisputed possession of the field. He soon appeared with a reply, entitled, *British Justice*[3]. Burghley's anxiety to have his views generally circulated, was shewn in an Italian translation of his pamphlet, which appeared soon after the original[4]. He has, in fact, furnished an ample defence of the prosecutions instituted[5]. In his day, this

---

[1] ALLEN. *ubi supra.*

[2] Three earls, six barons, several knights, *&c. Ibid.*

[3] BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* i. 187.

[4] May 28. STOWE. 694.

[5] May 30. *Ib.*

---

[1] Reprinted in the *Harleian Miscellany*. iii. 537.

[2] *A Particular Declaration or Testimony of the Undutifull and Traiterous Affection borne agaynst her Majestie, by Edmund Campion, Jesuit, and other condemned Priestes. Published by Authority.* Lond. 1582.

[3] "Then was he" (Campion) "moved as concerning his traiterous and heinous offence to the Queen's most excellent Majesty: whereto he answered, She is my lawful princess and queen; there somewhat he drew in his words to himself, whereby was gathered that somewhat he would have gladly spoken, but the great timerity and unstable opinion of his conscience, wherein he was at the time, even to the death, would not suffer him to utter it.—What time he spent his study, here in England, both in the hospital, and also at the university of Oxenford, he was always addicted to a marvellous suppose of himself, of ripe judgement, prompt audacity, and cunning conveyance of his school points, wherethrough he fell into a proud and vain-glorious judgement, practising to be eloquent in phrase, and so fine in his quirks and fastastical conjectures, that the ignorant he won by his smooth

---

devices; some other affecting his pleasant imaginations, he charmed with subtilty, and choked with sophistry." (*A Brief Discourse concerning the Deaths of Edmund Campion, &c. Seen and Allowed.* Lond. 1582.) Bartoli says that there was, "nel Campiano, una generosità di cuore animoso, e prode, ma niente meno modesto che libero: nel Personio un avvedimento di ben consigliato giudicio." (113.) The two were undoubtedly much unlike, but well fitted for united operations, if Persons could only retain an effective ascendancy. The one was rough, overbearing, and sagacious, the other mild, plausible, and forward. Thus the defects of each were neutralised, and materials were provided for working upon every temper.

[1] *De Persecutione Anglicana Libellus. Cum Licentia Superiorum.* Rom. 1582.

[2] *The Execution of Justice in England, not for Religion, but for Treason.* 17 Dec. 1583.

[3] *Ad Persecutores Anglos, pro Catholicis: contra falsum, seditiosum, et contumeliosum libellum inscriptum,* JUSTITIA BRITANNICA. No place, or date.

[4] *Atto della Giustitia d' Inghilterra, esseguito per la conservatione della commune, e Christiana Pace, contra alcuni seminatori di Discordie, e Seguaci di Ribelli, e de Nemici del Reame, e non per niuna Persecutione che fosse lor fatta per cagion della Religione; si come è stato falsamente publicato da difensori e da sostentatori della costoro rebellione e tradimento. Translato d' Inglese in Vulgare, da chi desidera che gli Italiani conoscano quanto i romori sparsi artificiosamente per tutta Italia, dell' Atto sopradetto sieno Bugiardi e Falsi.* Londra. Appresso Giovanni Wolfio. 1584.

[5] "Jesuits and Romish priests were sent over, who, in secret corners, whispered and infused into the hearts of many of the unlearned subjects of this realm, that the Pope had power to excom-

would be deemed sufficient for justifying the executions also.

Such topics rarely dwell upon public attention without injury to sufferers under mental disease. This was now shewn by John Somerville, a half-insane Romish gentleman of Elstow, in Warwickshire. He read and heard of heretics, excommunications, and murderous designs alleged, or denied, until his distempered brain was all on fire[1]. A neighbourhood feud added fuel to the flame. His father-in-law, Edward Arden, a landed proprietor of ancient lineage, seated at Park Hall, in the same county, had irritated Leicester, by a resolute contempt for his feelings and convenience[2]. He had even

---

municate and depose kings and princes, that he had excommunicated the late Queen, and discharged all her subjects of their oath, duties, and allegiance to her, and therefore, that they ought not to obey her, or any of her commandments, or laws, under pain of the Pope's curse. *This was high treason by the ancient laws of England*, and thereupon, Campion, Sherwin, and many other Romish priests, being apprehended, and confessing that they came into England to make a party for the Catholic cause, when need should require, were in the 21st year of the said late Queen's reign, indicted, arraigned, tried, adjudged, and executed for high treason against their natural allegiance which they owed their liege sovereign." (SIR EDW. COKE'S *Reports.* xxxiii.) Ralph Sherwin was a Devonshire man, admitted fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, through Sir William Petre, in July, 1568. He withdrew to Douay, and was ordained priest, March 23, 1577. —DODD. ii. 132.

Campion's name is sometimes written Champion; which was, probably, its pronunciation in England. Foreigners commonly wrote it Campi*an*. It would thus make better Latin and Italian forms.

[1] He "confessed the treason, and that he was moved thereunto in his wicked spirit, by certayne trayterous persons, his kinsmen and allies, and also by often reading of certayne seditious books lately published."—STOWE. 697. *Exec. Just.* 35. CAMBDEN. 494.

[2] Dr. Lingard says that he would not accommodate Leicester by selling him a portion of his estate, and that he refused to wear his livery. This "was wont to consist of hats or hoods, badges and other suits of one garment, by the year." (STRYPE. *Memorials.* iii. pt. 2. p. 161.) The retainers, as they were called, who accepted this, were commonly gentlemen,

aggravated indifference, by branding the proud favourite, as an adulterer, and an upstart[1]. Thus religious prejudice was embittered in these unfortunate gentlemen, by personal antipathy. They were galled by an overgrown neighbour, deep in the royal confidence, who was the patron of Puritanism, which could never view their sect, without hearing a call for its extermination. Haunted by sanguinary schemes to recover its ascendancy, Somerville left home for London. Meeting one or two Protestants on his way, his insane bigotry urged him to rush upon them with sword in hand[2]. For this he was taken into custody, when he confessed himself to have set out for the purpose of assassinating the queen. He was then committed to the Tower[3]; as were, within a few days, his father and mother-in-law, his wife, sister, and Hugh Hall, a reconciling missionary, who had acted as their confessor[4].

Upon this latter[5], as also upon Arden, the rack was tried[6], and in the unhappy priest's case with some success[7]. He was, however, put upon his trial, at Guildhall, together with Somerville, and the Ardens, man and wife[8]. All four were convicted. Hall's life had been redeemed by his disclosures. Mrs. Arden seems to have found protection in her sex. On the night preceding the day appointed for execution, Somerville strangled himself in

---

and only expected to attend on state occasions.

[1] Cambden. 495.

[2] *Ib.*

[3] Oct. 30.—*Diar. rer. gest. in Turri Lond.*

[4] Hall, Nov. 4. Arden, Nov. 7. the three females, Nov. 16.—*Ib.*

[5] Nov. 24.—*Ib.*

[6] Nov. 23.—*Ib.*

[7] "This gentleman who was drawn in by the cunning of the priest, and cast by his evidence." (Cambden. 495.) "From the latter" (Hall) "was drawn a confession that Arden had, in his hearing, wished the Queen were in heaven."—Lingard. viii. 206.

[8] Dec. 16.—*Diar. rer. gest. in Turri Lond.*

Newgate[1]. Arden was executed in Smithfield as a traitor[2]. The upshot of this tragedy gave great offence. There could be little reason for visiting so severely, encouragement, however blameable, given to the delusions of a maniac. Nor could people refrain from attributing the misery and ruin, which a mad enterprise had brought upon two wealthy families, to Leicester's resentful and selfish ends[3].

Seditious reading being named by Somerville himself as a main cause of his undoing, the government naturally felt his conviction as a new call to guard others from such infection. Theoretically, no freedom of the press existed, only such publications being allowed as had royal authority for their appearance, after careful examination[4]. But this restriction was habitually evaded. In spite of searches at the ports, prohibited books were imported in abundance[5]. Cupidity and necessity drove also domestic speculators to print clandestinely what could not openly be sold. Romish zeal, in one case, and probably, in more than one, made a private family set up a press in its mansion, and employ servants to work it[1]. Of those who sought gain by printing and selling forbidden publications, William Carter, formerly *amanuensis* to Harpsfield, had long been notorious. He had even been in custody, four years ago, for keeping a French political pamphlet, in favour of Mary, Queen of Scots[2]. Being, however, bold and artful, he took no warning from his danger, but reprinted, almost immediately afterwards, *A Treatise of Schisme*, by Gregory Martin, the bosom friend of Campion, and like him a renegade, and a Jesuit. This tract contains an ambiguous passage, which was represented as an exhortation to Elizabeth's ladies to murder her, as Judith murdered Holofernes[3]. Lawyers pronounced it high treason, and Carter was tried at the Old Bailey, as a traitor, for printing and vending it[1]. He pleaded, that it was mere allegory, Holofernes meaning sin and Satan, which Catholic ladies might destroy, by abstaining from Protestant worship, as Judith prepared the way for destroying the heathen captain, by abstaining from his meats[2]. This interpretation being overruled, as forced, by Andersen, the judge, a verdict of guilty was returned, after a quarter of an hour's deliberation[3]. The prosecution must fairly be taken as an evidence that Martin's obscurity and absurdity passed ordinarily for a suggestion to murder the queen[4]. The example made of this unhappy tradesman was in the sanguinary, yet ineffective spirit, with which that age indiscriminately visited offenders. He was dragged, on the morning after his trial, to Tyburn, and underwent the usual penalties of treason[5].

---

[1] Dec. 19. He and Arden were then brought from the Tower, probably, to be near Smithfield, and Somerville strangled himself within two hours after.—STOWE. 697.

[2] Dec. 20. Both his head and Somerville's were placed on London bridge. His quarters were placed on the city gates. The body of Somerville, probably, as a *felo de se*, was buried in Moorfields.

[3] CAMBDEN. 495. Dr. Lingard says that Leicester gave the lands of his victim to one of his own dependants. The *Execution of Justice*, published while this unhappy and discreditable case was pending, speaks of Somerville as "a furious young man of Warwickshire, who, of late was discovered and taken in his way, coming with a full intent to have killed her Majesty." (34.) Watson says, "Two gentlemen about that time also, *viz. Anno* 1583, Mr. Arden, and Mr. Somerville, were convicted by the laws of the realm, to have purposed and contrived how they might have laid violent hands upon her Majesties sacred person. Mr. Somerville's confession therein was so notorious, as it may not be either qualified or denied."—*Imp. Cons.* 71.

[4] "We can neither saye nor print what we will, but that only which after view and diligent examination, hath, or should have priviledge from her Majesties lawefull authoritie."—CHARKE'S *Replie to a Censure.*

[5] *Ibid.*

---

[1] Stonar and Brinkler, two Romish gentlemen, were committed to the Tower, Aug. 13, 1581, together with four servants, employed in printing, who had been taken, as well as the press, in the house of Mrs. Stonar (*Diar. rer. gest. in Turri Lond.*), or, as Bartoli has it, "nel palagio di Madama la Stonar." 239.

[2] Bishop Aylmer to Lord Burghley. Dec. 30, 1579. STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. pt. 2. p. 271.

[3] The book was printed at Douay, 1578, reprinted at London, 1580. The fatal passage, which occurs among examples of persons who refused participation in religious rites deemed unlawful, is this: "Judith foloweth, whose godlye and constant wisdome, if our Catholike gentlewomen would folowe, they might destroye Holofernes, the master heretike, and amase all his retinew, and never defile their religion by communicating with them in anye smale poynt. She came to please Holofernes, but yet in her religion, she would not yeelde so muche as to eate of his meates, but brought of her owne with her, and tolde him plainelye, that being in his house, yet she must serve her Lorde and God stil, desiring for that purpose, libertie once a-day to go in and out of the gate." (LINGARD. viii. 527. Note W.) Carter had two presses at work, and having procured Allen's commendation of Martin's tract, he printed above a thousand of it. Martin, who was a great reader, and a good linguist, but a warm partisan, died at Rheims, in 1582.—FOULIS. *Romish Treasons.* 338.

The two Warwickshire gentlemen were hardly lodged in the Tower, before its dungeons received another miserable inmate, connected with their county[6]. Among the younger sons of Sir George Throgmorton, builder of Coughton Castle there, Sir Nicholas, the fourth, had honourably filled several public employments, which Cecil's greater success in life made him consider very ill requited. His repinings were suddenly cut short by a fatal indigestion, as it seems; which many thought an opportune escape from troubles that an aspiring, restless, disappointed spirit must have soon provoked[7]. Sir John, his father's seventh son, was a lawyer, and became chief justice of Chester. From this appointment he was dismissed, by Leicester's influence, for producing as the exact copy of an ancient document, what really contained insertions of his own to fill gaps caused in the original by age[1]. The struggling family of such a younger son could hardly be free from political discontent. Its once promising fortunes must have seemed unjustly crippled by lucky, selfish, artful favourites, to whose envious malignity both uncle and father had fallen victims. The former had opened an *intrigue* with Mary, Queen of Scots, while still upon the throne[2]. His nephew, Francis Throgmorton, the disgraced judge's eldest son, was now agent for conducting a clandestine correspondence between that unhappy princess and her continental friends. He was

---

[1] Jan. 10. Stowe. 698.

[2] Lingard. viii. 528. Bridgewater. 130.

[3] Bridgewater. 133.

[4] Cambden says of the Romanists, "They set forth books, wherein they exhorted the Queen's gentlewomen to act the like against the Queen, as Judith had done with applause and commendations against Holofernes."—497.

[5] Stowe. 698.

[6] Nov. 7. 1583.—*Diar. rer. gest. in Turri Lond.*

[7] "Though he discharged several embassies with a great deal of

---

diligence, and much to his praise, yet could he not be master of much wealth, nor rise higher than to those small dignities, though glorious in title, of chief cup-bearer of England, and chamberlain of the exchequer; and this because he acted in favour of Leicester against Cecil, whose greatness he envied. It was in Leicester's house, where, as he was feeding heartily at supper upon a salad, he was seized, as some say, with an inflammation of the lungs, as others, with a catarrh, not without suspicion of poison; and died very luckily for himself and family, his life and estate being in great danger by reason of his turbulent spirit." (CAMBDEN. 430.) Sir Nicholas Throgmorton died Feb. 12, 1570, Cecil says in his Diary, *ex pleurisi et peripneumonia.* Leicester, in a letter to Walsingham, two days afterward, says of him, "His lungs were perished." He seems to have said, the day before his death, that he had taken poison in a salad. It is clear enough that he became dreadfully sick after this fatal supper, as might be expected of a man out of health eating voraciously of salad. Scandal soon discovered that Leicester had poisoned him, fearing his disclosures to Cecil, with whom he had been lately reconciled.—STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. 35. NARE's *Burghley.* ii. 546. MILNER's *Letters to a Prebendary.* 162.

[1] CAMBDEN. 497. "D. Joannes Throgmortonus, eques auratus, doctissimus pariter atque clarissimus, per calumniam a Lecestrio oppressus, in squalore antea vitam finierat."—BRIDGEWATER. 172.

[2] His letter may be seen in Melville.—*Memoirs.* 60.

also in the confidence of Don Bernardin de Mendoza, an insidious Jesuit[1], who resided in England, as Spanish ambassador. The English government had been aware, for several months, of young Throgmorton's dangerous agency, but thought it enough to watch him, until some decisive information could be gained. At length, a letter to the Queen of Scots was intercepted[2]. Among his connections was Charles Paget (brother to the peer), who lived abroad, a pensioner of Spain[3]. It was discovered that he had lately been in England, under the names of Mope and Spring, communicating with distinguished Romanists, and making observations on the Sussex coast[4]. Farther delay appeared unnecessary, and perhaps also unsafe. Two gentlemen were sent to Francis Throgmorton's house, at Paul's Wharf, in London, with a warrant. One of them conveyed him away in custody, the other stayed behind to search the premises. Before he was removed, he contrived an excuse to retire into his bedroom, and thence he clandestinely sent, by means of a female servant, a casket covered with velvet, to Mendoza, the Spanish ambassador's. Of the remaining papers, only two were considered as evidence. They were lists, identical, it seems, in matter, but in different hands, of

---

[1] "His Holiness, by the false instigations of the Jesuits, plotted with the king of Spain, for the assistance of the duke of Guise, to enterprise upon the sudden, a very desperate designment against her Majesty, and for the deliverance and advancement to the crown of the Queen of Scotland. For the better effecting whereof, Mendoza, the Jesuit, and ledger" (resident) "for the King of Spain in England, set on work a worthy gentleman otherwise, one Mr. Francis Throckmorton, and divers others."—*Important Considerations.* 70.

[2] CAMBDEN. 497.

[3] He had eighty crowns a month. Document from the State-Paper Office, printed in TOWNSEND's *Supplementary Letter to Charles Butler, Esq.* Lond. 1826. p. 77.

[4] Walsingham was so informed. (LINGARD. viii. 207.) The fact was afterwards established by Throgmorton's confession.

Romish gentlemen, and of places fit for the disembarkation of troops. At first, he feigned ignorance of both papers, charging those who searched his house with *foisting* them *in*; but afterwards, he made little or no difficulty in admitting himself to have written one, and eventually was drawn from him the same admission as to the other. Besides them were found several pedigrees to prove Mary's title, and a variety of libels, published abroad, against Elizabeth[1].

The owner of such a house was evidently a dangerous man. But lawyers would wish a stronger case, and statesmen would see a tantalising prospect of further information, that might prove material. To serve the ends of both, the defenceless prisoner was stretched upon the rack[2]; his friends assert, with great severity: but that is denied. It proved a fruitless outrage. Being again fastened within the dreaded frame, the shuddering sufferer no sooner felt its horrid machinery at work, than he professed willingness to make a full disclosure[3]. He was immediately unbound, and his depositions taken. These admitted privity to various treasonable designs ever since his journey to Spa, upon which he held intercourse with Sir Francis Englefield, and other English exiles. He declared himself to have acquainted his late father with some of these projects, and to have been advised by him to abandon them, as impracticable. He continued, however, to communicate with his brother Thomas, and with Thomas Morgan, both of whom resided in France, and were engaged in contriving deliverance for the Queen of Scots. This was to be effected by means of an invasion under the Duke of Guise, for which financial arrangements were actually making in Spain and Italy, and for which encouragement had been sought in England, by an emissary secretly sent over during the last August. Another object of the projected invasion, was to force the queen into a toleration of Romanism. If she resisted, her deposition was determined upon[1].

---

[1] *A Discoverie of the Treasons practised and attempted against the Queenes Majestie and the Realme, by Francis Throckmorton.* 1584. *Harleian Miscellany.* iii. 182.

[2] Nov. 23. "Equuleo gravissime torquetur." (*Diar. rer. gest. in Turri Lond.*) "He was layd upon the same, and somewhat pinched, although not much; for at the end of three days following, he had recovered himself, and was in as good plight as before the time of his racking, which, if had then, or at any other time, bene ministred unto him with that violence that hee and his favourers have indeavoured slaunderously to give out, the signes thereof would have appeared upon his limmes for many yeeres."—*Discoverie of the Treasons*, &c. 185.

[3] Dec. 2. "Bis eodem die." (*Diar. rer. gest. in Turri Lond.*) "The second time that he was put to the racke, before he was strayned up to any purpose, hee yeelded to confesse." (*Discoverie*, &c. 185.) Perhaps he might have been merely laid upon the rack in an earlier part of the same day.

Of Throgmorton's intimacy with the Spanish ambassador, there was no question. While in London, he had been known to visit him twice a week at least. When arraigned, he accounted for this by alleged negotiations to supply his brother abroad with money[2]. That such was the real reason of such frequent calls, no one could believe; nor did Cecil deny implicit credence to the very probable explanation which torture had extorted. Hence he taxed Mendoza severely with abusing his ambassadorial character. The Spaniard haughtily recriminated, complaining of Elizabeth's interference in the Netherlands, and of the pecuniary losses which his nation had undergone as well from her own policy, as from her buccaneering subjects. It was not, however, thought advisable to suffer him any longer in England, and while angrily expecting a formal dismissal, he secretly with-

[1] *Discoverie*, &c. 186.

[2] *Ib.* 188.

drew to Paris[1], where his intrigues fully justified Cecil's charges, and Throgmorton's confessions. In these, one seeming inconsistency occasioned some embarrassment. The English ambassador in France heard much of traitorous designs, and active hostility, but could see no appearance of any actual preparation for invading England[2]. While this, however, threw a doubt upon the tortured prisoner's veracity, letters from Scotland were intercepted and deciphered, informing Mary that her son approved of Guise's enterprise against his southern neighbour[3].

---

[1] CAMBDEN. 497.

[2] "Still of all sides, and very credibly, I am advertised, that there is a meaning and a good will to annoy your Majesty by all means, by the way of Scotland, and private councils had about it; whereto, as I writ before to Mr. Secretary, Mannyngville is called, and private conferences had with him, with a meaning to send him into Scotland, and to have men to go to the number of 1500, and to land at Dumbritton, and to fortify both the town underneath, and the castle: and withal, that levies be already making, but when I send to the places, I find nothing, but rather things in show, and given out by the captains belonging to the Duke of Guise, than otherwise. I pray God keep his continual hand of his grace upon your Majesty, as he hath done hitherto, and to preserve you from all enterprises against your person, which your Majesty must be carefuller to look to than ever, with more care of yourself, both for your own sake, and all your poor subjects: for assure yourself that I know for a certainty, out of the bowels of your evil-disposed subjects here, and of them that are here furtherers of their naughty fashion, that they are out of hope of all ways and enterprises to hurt you, but only two: the one by the way of Scotland, which they gave out that they have assuredly at their commandment, the other by the destruction of your person, which they hope for."—Sir Edward Stafford (ambassador in France) to the Queen. Dec. 18, 1583. (*Hardwicke Miscellaneous State Papers.* Lond. 1778. i. 197.) Again, Stafford says,—"There was never more of our naughty people in France than there is now, nor that speak so villainously, nor so plainly, against your Majesty, nor that seek every hole open where they may be some practises found against you." (198.) Elizabeth and her ministers could not receive such intelligence without uneasiness and exasperation, however happy they might be to learn that preparations were not in active progress for striking the threatened blow.

[3] Letters in the *Sadler State Papers* (iii. pp. 131—133.) ap-

His inaction might seem to have been laid upon sheer poverty; therefore, it was terminable at any time by means of a seasonable subsidy from France. Though an infamous witness, the rack was now corroborated, and its victim was put upon his trial at Guildhall[1]. His own confessions were the chief evidence against him. These he declared fictions extorted by nature's eagerness to escape farther agonies upon the rack. Corroborative facts denied him credence, and he was convicted. He then retracted his denial in a letter to the queen[2]. But this failed of mollifying the government, and he underwent, at Tyburn, the usual penalties of treason[3]. With his dying breath he talked of innocence, imputing his first confession entirely to horror of the torture, the

---

prove of Guise's interference: a portion of one of them is thus translated from the original French, in *Queen Elizabeth and her Times* (ii. 209). "Your son assured me that he is determined to send me into France with all diligence. I perceive that he is altogether given to pursue the friendship and league of that kingdom, and to follow in everything the counsel of Monsieur de Guise, to finish the treaty begun between you and him. So if you give good order there, I think that your affairs may easily be brought to a good end. The poverty of your son is so great, that he cannot put in execution the least part of his design. Wherefore I pray you hold a hand by your means and counsel with regard to Monsieur de Guise and others, that he may be aided in that. I am myself obliged to undertake this voyage at my expense, which I cannot well support, if your Majesty does not cause me to receive aid." In the next letter, said in the margin to be "from Mr. of Gray by the king's commandment," we have, "Sa maj. estime le dissing de Monsieur de Guise, son cousin, touchant son entreprise en Angleterre." Such announcements have no great precision, but the chance of interception is enough to account for this, and allowance would be made for that very circumstance by the parties whose ruin was sought.

[1] May 21. STOWE. 698. He thought himself protected by a statute of the 13th of the Queen, which sets a limit of six months to prosecutions for certain treasons. But this objection was overruled, and he was put upon his trial under the old *Statute of Treasons*, 25 Edward III.—*Discoverie*, &c. 190.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] July 10. STOWE. 698.

second, to anxiety for pardon[1]. These were, undoubtedly, the iron fingers that unsealed his lips, but the words which flowed had every mark of truth. Bred in personal, no less than in sectarian discontent, with one brother an exiled pensioner of Spain[2], another so suspected as to warrant an arrest[3], himself a two years' medium of ciphered communication for the queen of Scots[4],—this unhappy gentleman could hardly be less guilty than his own avowals made him. A modern court of justice might not think such evidence as cast him sufficient for the purpose. But, unquestionably, his doings were as dangerous, and the times also, as those which led a far more enlightened age to suspend the *Habeas Corpus* Act. It is true that an English birthright was then only so far infringed as to authorise imprisonment. Elizabeth's day had neither learnt such moderation, nor acquired those appliances for using it, which have been the gradual fruit of increasing opulence.

Soon after Throgmorton's execution, William Creighton, a Scottish Jesuit, returning to his native country, was taken at sea by a piratical Dutch cruiser. One of his first cares under this misfortune, was to tear up a paper, and cast it overboard. By a miracle, as he said afterwards himself, most of the fragments were blown back, but another hand collected them. Sir William Waad carefully put them together again, and they proved an Italian plan, written about two years previously, for invading England[1]. Creighton, together with his companion, Patrick Abdy, a Scottish secular priest, were immediately sent over into England, and lodged in the Tower[2]. Being interrogated before the rack, Creighton disclosed various particulars of those invading projects which occasioned so much uneasiness in England[3]. Elizabeth's valued life now seemed seriously endangered, one treachery being no sooner punished, than another was discovered. Probably her own apprehensions became importunate. Leicester, accordingly, organised an association for her protection. Those who joined it, solemnly promised, under their hands and seals, not only to punish by death, if possible, every attempt upon the queen's life, even if unsuccessful, but also to exclude from the throne all who should authorise any such attempt, or be meant to reap the benefit of it. The former clause of this engagement naturally came from the just alarm of a loyal people, the latter was evidently levelled at the unfortunate Mary of Scotland. She felt the blow acutely, but soon rallying, offered her own signature to the association, so far as could be done without prejudicing her son and their common heirs[1]. This qualified adhesion was declined. The nation generally shewed its feeling for the sovereign, and its admiration of her government, by taking the engagement as it stood.

---

[1] Cambden. 498. Lingard. viii. 210.

[2] Thomas Throgmorton received from Philip fifty-five crowns a month.—Townsend. *ut supra.*

[3] George Throgmorton was arrested Nov. 17, 1583. (*Diar. rer. gest. in Turri Lond.*) This might be from the discovery of these words scratched with coal, intended for him, *I would faine know whether my casket be safe.* This was the casket with Mary's correspondence conveyed to Mendoza. George Throgmorton does not appear to have been tortured, a proof that, as was asserted, none were thus used without good reason to know their guilt. He received a pension of thirty crowns a month from Philip.—Townsend. *ut supra.*

[4] Francis Throgmorton's Declaration to the Queen. (*Discoverie*, &c. 191.) Bridgewater says, that this unhappy young man met his cruel death, "ob eam solam causam a Leecestrii artificiis, quod Catholicus esset, ac Catholicis captivis ex animo faveret." (172.) Such are the loose misrepresentations to which we owe ignorance and prejudice.

---

[1] Cambden. 499. Lingard. viii. 213. note.

[2] Sept. 16. "Contra omne jus gentium." (*Diar. rer. gest. in Turri Lond.*) "Of late one Crichton, a Scottish Jesuite, was taken by a shippe set forth by the admiral of Zealand, and sent hither by him unto hir majestie, abowt whom was found a very daungerous plott sett down abowt two yeares past in the Italian tongue, for the invading of this realme. And although it was torn in peeces, and divers parts thereof lost, yet have we gathered the sense thereof."—Walsingham to Sadler. Sept. 16, 1584. *Sadler State Papers.* iii. 158.

[3] Cambden. *ut supra.*

While it was under general discussion, writs were issued for the calling of a new parliament. When this body met[2], it passed a bill for giving legality to the principles of the association. But Elizabeth sent a royal message to retrench some of its most objectionable provisions. Her judicious interference removed responsibility from all whose guilt had not been pronounced by a regular commission. Mary and her heirs also were excused from forfeiture, unless the queen should be taken off by violence[3]. The Puritanical party was, as usual, strong in the Lower House, and attempts were made, which court authority made abortive, to force such regulations upon the church, as had long been clamorously demanded[4]. An assembly largely leavened by such views, was not likely to think excessive, any new severities against Romanism. A bill, accordingly, passed both Houses, after careful consideration in committee by each of them[1], which rendered all native Jesuits, and seminary priests, found in the realm, after forty days were past, liable to the penalties of high treason. To aid, or receive such persons was made felony. To know of their presence without discovering them, within twelve days, was to be punishable by fine or imprisonment, at the queen's pleasure. All students in the seminaries, *or religious*, who should not obey within six months, a proclamation to recall them, and should not take the oath of supremacy before the diocesan, or two justices, were to be treated as traitors. Those of them who accepted these conditions, were not to come within twelve miles of the court during the first ten years. Remittances to them were to incur a *præmunire*. Parents sending a child abroad without license, were to forfeit one hundred pounds, and any one so sent was to be incapable of inheriting from the sender[2].

---

[1] CAMBDEN. *ut supra.*

[2] Nov. 23.—D'EWES. 311.

[3] LINGARD. viii. 217.

[4] By petition to the Upper House. This embraces, 1. The propriety of suspending ministers found incompetent, on examination. 2. The removal of unlearned men, beneficed since 1575. 3. The future ordination of none insufficiently qualified. 4. Restrictions upon ordination, where six able, resident ministers, at least, do not concur with the bishop. 5. Refusal of orders to any unprovided with a cure then vacant. 6. Refusal of institution until competent notice to the parish, that due inquiry may be made into the party's qualifications. 7. Relaxation as to oaths and subscriptions. 8. Latitude as to using the Liturgy, and ceremonies. 9. Restraint upon the jurisdiction of officials and commissaries over clergymen. 10. Restoration of suspended or deprived preachers. 11. Discontinuance of examinations, *ex officio.* 12. Revival of the *prophesyings*, under proper regulation. 13. Restraint upon excommunications. 11. Excommu-

---

nications for great scandals by the bishops personally, with assistance from grave persons, or by others "of calling in the church, with like assistance." 15. Discontinuance of pluralities and non-residence. 16. Exaction of able preaching curates from actual non-residents. In her speech of prorogation, Elizabeth thus arrogantly and ridiculously, as moderns would think, adverted to the Puritanical spirit of the Lower House. "There be some fault-finders with the order of the clergy, which may so make a slander to myself and the church, whose over-ruler God hath made me, whose negligence cannot be excused, if any schisms or errors heretical were suffered. Thus much I must say, that some faults and negligences may grow and be, as in all other great charges it happeneth; and what vocation without? All which, if you, my lords of the clergy, do not amend, I mean to depose you. Look ye, therefore, well to your charges. This may be amended without heedless or open exclamations."—D'EWES. 359. 328.

[1] *Ibid.* 341, 319.

[2] COLLIER. ii. 594. LINGARD. viii. 219. "In the 27th year of her reign, by authority of Parliament, her Majesty made it treason for any Jesuit, or Romish priest,

It is obvious that some enactments of this kind were nothing more than strictly defensive measures, but these were excessive. While validity was claimed for papal bulls menacing England with bloodshed and confusion, its government fairly refused shelter to those who came from the teachers of such doctrine. In the case of Jesuits, its justification was complete. Monkish combinations are not necessary to the full toleration of Romanism, nor need rulers hesitate, at any time, to clear their dominions of men who merge individual responsibility in the movements of an organized body, and the dictation of an alien superior.

The House of Commons was all but unanimous in considering this "a good and necessary bill[1]." The only dissentient appears to have been Dr. William Parry, member for Queenborough. He inveighed violently against the whole measure, as "savouring of treasons, full of blood, danger, terror, and despair to the friends and relations of them all; full of confiscations too, yet such as would not enrich the queen." He did not, however, expect his invectives to bear any weight with either House, both being evidently animated by a zeal that must carry

---

being her natural born subject, and made a priest or Jesuit, sithence the beginning of her reign, to come into any of her dominions, intending thereby to keep them out of the same, to the end that they should not infect any other subjects with such treasonable and damnable persuasions and practices as are aforesaid, which, without controversy, were high treason by the ancient common laws of England: neither would any magnanimous king of England, sithence the first establishment of this monarchy, have suffered any, (especially being his own natural born subjects) to live, that persuaded his subjects that he was no lawful king, and practised with them, within the heart of this realm, to withdraw them from their allegiance and loyalty to their sovereign, the same being *crimen læsæ majestatis*, by the ancient laws of this realm."—Sir E. COKE'S *Reports*. xxxix.

[1] Speech of the speaker, John Puckering, serjeant at law, to Dr. Parry. Dec. 17.—D'EWES. 341.

the bill through. His only dependance, therefore, was upon her majesty, to whom alone he would state the reasons of his opposition[1]. This speech was naturally offensive to men bent unanimously the other way, and Parry's concealment of his motives from the very body that might need such information for its own guidance, and which had been disgusted by his vehemence, was, undoubtedly, alike unreasonable and uncourteous. Hence he was ordered to withdraw in custody, into the outer room. Being called in again, he was reprimanded by the speaker, and urged to make some sufficient explanation of his conduct. He said, however, a great deal about himself, and his services, but persisted in refusing to inform the House of his reasons. This was resented as a contempt, and he was placed under arrest[2]. Before many hours were over, he made some communication to the privy council, which the queen thought not altogether unsatisfactory, and by her means, the House restored him to his place, on the following day[3].

He was born at Northop, in Flintshire, where his father, who had a very large family[4], kept a public-house.

---

[1] Speech of Dr. Parry. Dec. 17.—D'Ewes. 340.

[2] Resolution of the House of Commons. Dec. 17.—*Ib.*

[3] Speech of Sir Christopher Hatton, Vice-chamberlain. Dec. 18.—*Ib.* 342.

[4] Thirty children; fourteen by his first wife, sixteen by the second, Parry's mother. This patriarch, represented by his unfortunate son as "a poor gentleman of no greater fortune than to be, as many gentlemen of that county were, of King Henry's guard, and appointed to attend upon Queen Mary, while she was princess," died about 1566, aged 108. It is added, "His land was very small; his best living was a lease of his parsonage of Northop." (Parry to Burghley. Strype. *Annals.* iii. 365.) The contemporary account, abridged by Strype, printed by Barker, the queen's printer, not only says that his father "kept a common ale-house," but also that "his eldest brother dwelleth at this present in the same house, and there keepeth an ale-house, as his father did before him." These accounts cannot be incorrect, but they are not incon-

He claimed, however, for his ancestors, the Ithels, or Bethels[1], ancient Flintshire gentry. Maternally, he sprang, according to his own account, from the Conways, of Bodrythan, in the same county. His mother, it is allowed, was natural daughter of a priest, named Conway, rector of Halkin[2]. When a lad, he was placed with a lawyer, at Chester, but ran away from him, and took refuge in London, where he went into service. His first considerable rise appears to have come from marriage with a Carmarthenshire widow, daughter of Sir William Thomas. During several years, he filled some sort of menial situation in the royal household[3]: no very favourable school for a mind like his, enslaved by luxury and ostentation. The seasonable death of his first wife gave him another matrimonial opening, which he did not lose, of providing for his expensive tastes. He married again, a wealthy widow, but now, one old enough for his mother. To her daughter, accordingly, he was charged with trans-

---

sistent with Parry's claims to a parentage where there was some property.

[1] Bethel is ap Ithel. Parry's father, however, is stated to have been called Harry ap David. According to the shifting patronymic form, usual then, and long afterwards, with Welsh surnames, this poor man's too-celebrated son properly called himself ap Harry. Upon the same principle, a son of his own would have been named Williams. His assumption of Parry was treated as a disguise to conceal the original ap Harry, and to set up a claim of relationship to various considerable families named Parry. But this is rather unfair, Parry being the English form of ap Harry.

[2] *A True and Plain Declaration of Horrible Treasons practised by William Parry against the Queen's Majesty.* 32.

[3] "In the year 1570, I was sworn her Majesties servant, from which time until the year 1580, I served, honoured, and loved her, with as great readiness, devotion, and assurance, as any poor subject in England." (Voluntary Confession of William Parry. *True and Plain Declaration, &c.* 9.) "From the service of the Earl of Pembroke, he passed to that of the Queen, and by the appointment of Lord Burleigh, resided several years in different parts of the continent, to collect and transmit secret intelligence for the use of that minister." —LINGARD. viii. 220.

ferring his attentions, and a long separation from the old lady gives probability to the scandalous tale[1]. Undoubtedly, however, there was enough to warrant her disgust in his utter want of economy and principle. The former deficiency drove him to borrow a sum of money from an individual, named Hare; the latter to seek release from a suit which that gentleman began, by breaking into his chambers, in the Temple, and making an attempt upon his life[2]. For this crime, being tried at the Old Bailey, he received sentence of death, as a burglar. His court connections, probably, saved him. He was pardoned, and went abroad[3]. On the continent, he was employed by the English ministry, as a spy, during several years. The gay gallantry that had captivated two rich widows, was now wholly thrown aside. He appeared as a grave student, graduated, and was ostensibly engaged in qualifying himself to practise as a civilian[4]. He certainly would have been glad to return home, but he found himself unable to set foot in England without molestation from creditors[5]. His chief continental business appears to have been the negotiation of various affairs in their own country for the English refugees[1]. As a fellow-religionist, he brought over no great claim upon their confidence, having taken repeatedly the oath of supremacy[2], though an habitual absentee from the Sacrament[3]. But he had been long about the court in their native country, and was thus far from unlikely to have means of serving them. The English ministry naturally took care to keep him in credit, by attending to some of his applications. In return for such attention, he betrayed the secrets of those whom he served. But these were seldom of such importance as to overcome the parsimony of Elizabeth's government, and Parry complained of an ill requital for valuable services. Soon after his arrival in France, he was reconciled to the Papal Church, and subsequently, at Milan, his belief was formally investigated by the Inquisition[4]. It is plain, that he had become very anxious to take any kind of advantage that Romanism might offer for an escape from disgrace and poverty. He was, in fact, a vain, ambitious, extravagant, plausible, unprincipled man, ever in straits, and ever scheming to get out of them.

---

[1] "My wife hath 80*l.* yearly: whereof I have not handled penny for some years past."—Parry to Burghley. STRYPE. *Annals.* iii. 365.

[2] At the close of 1580. He seems not to have been released until Midsummer, 1582. Mr. Hare, though not killed, was very severely wounded. Parry, however, quietly says, "I had some trouble for the hurting of a gentleman of the Temple." Nevertheless, as usual with offenders of all sorts, he talks of himself as an injured man, adding, "In which action, I was so disgraced and oppressed by two great men, to whom I have of late been beholden, that I never had contented thought since."—Voluntary Confession. *ut supra.*

[3] He applied for license to travel for three years, in July, 1582: having obtained this, he went abroad in the next month.—*Ibid.*

[4] "He cast away all his former lewd manners, changed his degree and habit, and bought or begged the grave title of a doctor of law, for which he was well qualified by a little grammar-school Latin."—*True and Plain Declaration, &c.* 34.

[5] STRYPE. *Annals.* iii. 375.

---

[1] He wrote to Burghley, that "he found his credit and favour to be such with the best of the English and Scottish nations, in Rome and Paris, by the hope conceived of his readiness and ability to serve them, that he doubted not, in a few months, to be well able to discover their deepest practices."—Strype. *Annals.* iii. 371.

[2] "Before he travelled beyond the seas, at three several times within the compass of these two and twenty years past, he did voluntarily take the oath of obedience to the Queen's Majesty, set down in the statute made in the first year of her Highness' reign."—*True and Plain Declaration, &c.* 33.

[3] "I went over with doubtful mind of return, for that being suspected in religion, and not having received the communion in twenty-two years, I began to mistrust my advancement in England." (Confession, &c. *Ib.* 9.) So he went abroad, after pardon for a capital felony, merely because he thought himself unlikely to get forward, from doubts of his religious principles.

[4] Confession. *ut supra.*

Having again settled himself in England[1], he had several private interviews, not only with the ministers, but also with Elizabeth herself. To her he communicated various projects of assassination which had come to his knowledge on the continent[2]. His object was to be nominated master of St. Catharine's, or even to gain a pension. But in both he failed, and was bitterly disappointed. He now became closely intimate with a late officer in the Spanish army, Edmund Neville, who called himself Lord Latimer[3]: whose indigence was greater than his own, but whose head, like his, teemed with golden visions, and political discontent[1]. Regicide was the favourite theme of these unhappy men. Parry detailed sundry conversations abroad upon this question, with Romish divines, admitting that many of them would hear nothing of sophistry to justify murder. Such, indeed, he could not deny, was the general stream of English opinion: which he represented as a proof that the national theology was rather behind that of the continent[2]. Scotland was equally backward, Creighton, the Jesuit, now in the Tower, having told him that assassination was altogether unlawful[3]. But then, he inferred a contrary doctrine, from Allen's answer to Burghley[4], and he declared himself to have received sufficient approbation of his murderous purpose from certain foreign Jesuits[1]. More than

---

[1] He landed at Rye, in January, 1584.—Confession. *ut supra.*

[2] *Ib.*

[3] Neville was descended from George Neville, fifth son of Ralph, first earl of Westmoreland, which George was summoned to Parliament as Baron Latimer, in 1432. The eldest branch of this George ended in four females, sisters, on the death of John Neville, Lord Latimer, in 1577, between whom the barony fell into abeyance. The eldest of these ladies became countess of Northumberland, the second was married to Thomas Cecil, elder son of Lord Burghley. Edmund Neville was lineal male descendant of George Neville, but as John Neville, descendant of the eldest branch, left female heirs, it is rather surprising, that this descendant of a younger branch should have thought himself entitled to the barony of Latimer. Parry, however, called him *my Lord*, and a letter of his to Burghley, Oct. 13, 1585, is signed *Edmund Latymer.* (STRYPE. *Annals.* iii. 460.) On the death of Charles Neville, attainted in 1570 for the northern rebellion, he became next male heir to the forfeited earldom of Westmoreland, and he seems to have built immediately upon obtaining a reversal of his unfortunate relative's attainder. Dr. Lingard says that he had been engaged abroad as a spy of the English government, and that, "as long as Persons resided at Rouen, he had been employed to watch the motions of that enterprising Jesuit." (viii. 224.) Strype conjectures him to have been a pensioner of Spain, as he talks to Burghley of having "lost his living abroad." His name, however, does not appear in the list of Philip's pensioners printed by Mr. Townsend. He was long detained prisoner in the Tower: it being, probably, considered unsafe to set at large a person so desperate and dangerous. Parry talked of Neville as his cousin, claiming a relationship to him through Sir John Conway, whom he represented as maternally of kin to himself. The male heir of Westmoreland and Latimer would, no doubt, have spurned such a claim, had not his ancestral greatness been under a total eclipse; but a brother beggar and schemer might be borne in babbling about community of blood.

---

[1] Parry kept house in Fetter Lane, Neville had only lodgings, and these he shifted from Whitefriars to Hern's Rents, Holborn. Parry says of him, he "came often to mine house, put his finger in my dish, his hand in my purse, and the night wherein he accused me, was wrapped in my gown." (Declaration of Edmund Neville. Feb. 10, 1585. Voluntary Confession of William Parry. *True and Plain Declaration.* 5. 13.) "From whose wars" (Philip's) "the said Neville, having served in them, had lately returned poor into England."—Report to the House of Commons. Feb. 24. D'Ewes. 356.

[2] "Though it be true, or likely, that most of our English divines, less practised in matters of this weight, do utterly mislike and condemn it."—Parry to her Majesty. Feb. 14, 1585. *Declaration.* 15.

[3] Parry took considerable pains, at Lyons, to argue or entrap Creighton into a contrary decision, but the Jesuit met him at every point in a sound and Christianlike manner. When first questioned about it, he did not remember the particulars, but he afterwards communicated them in a manly letter to Walsingham, from the Tower, Feb. 20. He had received a pension from Spain of thirty crowns a month, his brother of twenty-five. To a knowledge of these circumstances he was probably indebted both for Parry's confidence and his own imprisonment.

[4] This tract makes use of various Protestant authorities, approving of civil resistance to defend religion, and argues that a pope is fitter than a multitude, to name the time for beginning such resistance. The inference as to Elizabeth, and the bulls denouncing her, is obvious. Dr. Lingard has stated Allen's positions more at length. (Note V. viii. 526.) Parry speaks in his Confession of receiving this book from France, in July, 1584, adding, "It re-

---

doubled my former conceits: every word in it was a warrant to a prepared mind: it taught that kings may be excommunicated, deprived, and violently handled; it proveth that all wars, civil or foreign, undertaken for religion, are honourable." His intention he states to have been originally conceived from reading Allen "*De Persecutione Anglicana*, and other discourses of like argument."—*True and Plain Decl.* 10. 13.

[1] At Venice, from *Benedicto Palmio*, (or "P. Benedetto Palmi*a*," as Bartoli writes) at Paris, in confession, from a Spaniard, *Anibal a Codreto*. Dr. Lingard says nothing of the latter, and of the former, Parry "addressed himself to Palma, another Jesuit, who refused to listen to his proposals, but conducted him to Campeggio, the papal minister." (viii. 221.) Parry's own confession says, "I asked his opinion; he made it clear, commended my devotion, comforted me in it, and after a while, made me known to the nuncio Campeggio." (10.) Subsequently, Persons, on the alleged authority of his own letter, was charged with being privy to Parry's design. "It appeareth also that Robert Parsons, whose head is now become a mint of treasons, had a finger in this businesse. His own letter, dated the 18th of October, 1598, will convince him, if he deny it. For therein he confesseth, *how when he perceived that a certaine English gentleman meant to discover Parries practise against the Queene, that he did dissuade him, and so wrought with the man, that he was content Parry should proceed on without being by him betrayed.*" The accuser here seems to be, "one William Browne, *alias* Ch. P." who, "in a letter dated the 16th of August, *anno* 1599, affirmeth that he hath a letter of Parsons his own hand, dated 1598, wherein he confesseth *that he knew of Parries practise for the killing of the Queene, and that the said Parsons kept backe a gentleman that intended to discover the same.* A certaine other Papisticall fellow, in a treatise concerning the Practises of Jesuits for killing of Princes, doth charge Parsons for advancing the practise of Parry." (SUTCLIFFE's *Full and Round Answer.* 209. 228.) Could the *gentleman* meant here be Morgan? Parry was with him in Paris, in the autumn of 1583, and talked of his design, and says that he was the only Englishman to whom he had communicated it. Of this communication, however, there was no proof by any "letter or cipher," as Parry wrote to the queen. His letter is printed at length by Strype. (*Annals.* Append. 46. iii. 338.) The ministry, unwisely, garbled it, in their *True and Plain Declaration*, and among the missing passages, is this, which admits the absence of written proof against Thomas Morgan. The Queen of Scots maintained that Parry could not have truly accused Morgan, and if he be the *gentleman* of Sutcliffe's extracts, this must be correct, as to approbation. Parry, however, makes

all, he had a letter from Cardinal Como, regularly communicating the pope's approbation of his design, and promising a plenary indulgence, on its execution[1]. To this

---

him propose the Queen's murder, and on his own demur, refer to Persons for authority, which he himself declined. He adds, that while they were discussing, Watts, a learned priest, came in, and pronounced unequivocally against the attempt. He states himself to have finally resolved upon it, in confession to the Jesuit Codreto.

[1] Dated Rome, Jan. 30, 1584. He received it at Greenwich, in March, while soliciting for St. Catharine's, and shewed it to some about the queen, who made her acquainted with it. On his apprehension, it was seized and produced against him. "The letter of the cardinal furnished a pretence for the most violent declamation against the Pope, as if he had been acquainted with the design to kill the Queen, and had granted a pardon for it beforehand. The fact, however, is, that Parry, in his letter, never alluded to the design. He merely said that he was returning to England, and hoped to atone for his past misdeeds, by his subsequent services to the Catholic Church. The answer of the cardinal may be seen in Sadler. The indulgence mentioned in it was that which was given to persons, on their reconciliation, a remission of canonical censures incurred by former offences." (LINGARD. viii. 223. note.) Parry, however, himself said of this pontifical communication, "It confirmed my resolution to kill her, and made it clear in my conscience, that it was lawful and meritorious." The letter is: *Mon Signore, la Santità di N. S. ha veduto le lettere di V. S. del primo, con la fede inclusa, e non se puo se non laudare la buona disposittione e risolutione che scrive di tenere verso il servitio e beneficio publico, nel che la Santità sua l'essorta di perseverare con farne riuscire li effetti che V. S. promette. Et accioché tanto maggiormente V. S. sia ajutata da quel buon Spirito che l'ha mosso, li concede sua Beneditione, plenaria indulgenza, e remissione di tutti li peccati, secondo che V. S. ha chiesto, assicurando V. S. che si oltre il merito che n'havera in cielo, vuole anco sua Santità constituirsi debitore a riconoscere li meriti di V. S. in ogni miglior modo che potra, e cio tanto piu quanto che V. S. usa maggior modestia in non pretender niente. Metta dunq.; ad effetto li suoi santi e honorati pensieri, e attenda esser sano. Che per fine io me le offero di core, e le desidero ogni buono e felice successo.* The official translation is this: "Monsignor, the Holiness of our Lord hath seen the letter of your Signory of the first, with the assurance included, and cannot but commend the good disposition and resolution which you write to hold towards the service and benefit public: wherein his Holiness doth exhort you to persevere, with causing to bring forth the effects which your Signory promiseth. And to the end you may be so much the more holpen, by that good Spirit which hath moved you thereunto, his

he had bound himself by a solemn vow, which once was on the very point of fulfilment[1]. Still, Neville, according

Blessedness doth grant to you plenary indulgence and remission of all your sins, according to your request. Assuring you, that, besides the merit that you shall receive therefore in heaven, his Holiness will further make himself debtor to re-acknowledge the deservings of your Signory in the best manner that he can. And that so much the more, in that your Signory useth the greater modesty in not pretending any thing. Put, therefore, to effect your holy and honourable thoughts, and attend your health. And to conclude, I offer myself unto you heartily, and do desire all good and happy success." (*True and Plain Decl.* 20.) Does, then, all this wordy mystification mean nothing more than "a remission of canonical censures incurred by former offences"? Why should the pope interfere personally for such a purpose? Does he mean by "service and benefit public," nothing else than that Parry was to set hereafter a better example? Did the pope himself expect to be so much edified thereby, that he would feel himself "a debtor to re-acknowledge the deservings" of this altered man? If ordinary assurances are to come from Rome cloaked in this manner, a little "violent declamation" may be excused in people accustomed only to plain writing. Even Persons was rather puzzled by this case, observing that "Parry, in his letter to Gregory 13. discovered no intention at all of any particular enterprise he had in hand," and that, "this indulgence took effect, if Parry were contrite, and confessed of his sins." (*Full and Round Answer.* 346.) Elizabeth, with her ministers, and contemporaries generally, were justified in presuming that information might have been communicated collaterally, which could not appear in a letter to the pontiff directly, and that prudence, no less than decency, required a wrapper where assassination was at bottom. In fact, one of the first things that Parry did with his letter was to lay it before the very persons, whom, according to him, it vitally concerned. Nor can there be a doubt of his disposition to betray the pope, if he could have gotten thereby the mastership of St. Catharine's, or a pension, or any other such prize. New difficulties might have brought him to Rome again as a penitent offering new services.

[1] "When I looked upon her Majesty, and remembered her many excellences, I was greatly troubled: and yet I saw no remedy; for my vows were in heaven, my letters and promises in earth." (Parry's Confession. *True and Plain Decl.* 13.) "Doctor Parry, that had vowed to kill her, being alone with her in the garden at Richmond, and then resolved to act that tragedy, was so daunted with the majesty of her presence, in which he then saw the image of her grandfather, King Henry 7. as himself confessed, that his heart would not suffer his hand to execute that which he had resolved."

to his own account, demurred. Nor need he be disbelieved, because anything decisive would most have likely have been carried immediately by Parry, into Walsingham's office, as a marketable commodity. In the mean while, information reached Neville, that his relative, the attainted Earl of Westmoreland, was dead[1]. What an opening was there now for securing an earldom, and immense estates! Thus it became a race between two needy adventurers to gain a prize by treachery. Neville got in first, and Parry was arrested[2].

At first he would admit nothing. Afterwards he could recollect mere abstract conversations, but rather theological than political, suggested by Allen's recent pamphlet. He had, however, scarcely faced the horrors of the Tower, before either his spirits gave way, or new hopes arose upon a display of candour. An ample confession painted him bound by a solemn vow, regularly approved at Rome, to murder the queen, and actually plotting with Neville to realise his flagitious purpose[3].

— Contemporary Sloane MS. Ellis's *Original Letters*. Second Series. iii. 192.

[1] "This continued as agreed upon, many months, until he heard of the death of Westmoreland, whose land and dignity, whereof he assured himself, bred belike this conscience in him to discover a treason in February, contrived and agreed upon in August."—Parry's Confession. *True and Plain Decl.* 14.

[2] Feb. 8. He was not formally taken into custody, but sent-for to Walsingham's house, and kept there all night. Being told of information received respecting treasonable designs, he was asked for farther light upon it, but professed utter ignorance. Even the threat of confronting him with some gentleman of quality, did not overcome his taciturnity; but in the morning, he said, that he had since remembered a conversation with Neville, upon regicide for the sake of religion, suggested by Allen's writings. Discourse about assassinating the queen, he utterly disclaimed, and would not admit it even when Neville was produced. He was, however, committed to the Tower, on that unhappy gentleman's deposition.

[3] Feb. 11. His confession was verbal, and made without any constraint. He afterwards re-

His brother members of parliament had indignantly heard him pleading for Jesuits and seminary-priests. Their indignation had now a substantial ground, which was promptly seized. He was expelled the House, and a new writ ordered for Queenborough[1]. On being put upon his trial at Westminster[2], he pleaded guilty, but before sentence, he vehemently denied any intention of killing the queen, appealing to her own knowledge, and to that both of Cecil and Walsingham. His confession in the Tower he declared extorted, by fear of the rack. An attempt was made to rebut this charge, but unsuccessfully; as he had evidently been told that, without willing utterance of the truth, his examination would be taken in the ordinary way[3]. A wretched prisoner could not misunderstand these horrid words. Nor, probably, in spite of Parry's real or pretended vows, did he speak falsely in denying a murderous intent. He rather meant himself for a trafficker in treason, or even an agent for assassination, than to become an actual assassin. His outrage upon Hare had, however, proved him at bottom a desperate ruffian[4]. Therefore Elizabeth and her ministry were justified in acting upon Neville's information. They had exasperated a necessitous, greedy, specious, yet ferocious man, by hearing numerous disclosures without

---

duced it to writing, and sent it to court on the 13th. Neville's deposition is dated the 10th, and Parry seems to have been committed to the Tower on that day.

[1] Feb. 18. D'Ewes. 352.

[2] Feb. 25. *True and Plain Decl.* 20.

[3] *Ibid.* 26.

[4] His pardon for assaulting Hare, left the claim untouched, and he gave bond for it, and for keeping the peace. His original securities, however, withdrew after a time. He contrived to replace them in a new bond for 1000*l.*, by Sir John Conway and Sir George Peckham. This arrangement, probably, enabled him to set up house in England, and get into parliament. He seems to have found means for making it in his wife's resources.—Strype. *Annals.* iii. 375.

requiting them with either place or pension. But Parry's temperament was too sanguine for any foresight of his real situation. When the judge was on the point of beginning his last awful address, he furiously exclaimed, *I never meant to kill her: I will lay my blood upon Queen Elizabeth and you, before God and the world*[1]. In the same denial he persisted at his execution, in Palace Yard[2]. But the mob hooted him with execration, both then, and on his way from trial[3]. To this popular hatred was, probably, owing, a barbarous aggravation of his revolting sentence. The strangling cord had scarcely time to stupify him when it was brutally cut, and odious mutilation instantly began. As his bowels were torn out, a heavy grown was heard, rendering it too likely, that, until then, the sufferer had lingered in needless agony[4].

---

[1] *True and Plain Decl.* 27. In his letter to the queen, of Feb. 14, Parry speaks of himself as "chiefly overthrown by your hard hand." This is one of the passages suppressed in the garbled publication from authority. It is a charge upon Elizabeth, not altogether undeserved, of drawing him into his actual situation by listening to his various communications. But probably no encouragement had been given him since he left the court in July, "utterly rejected, discontented," as he says in his confession. His treasonable communications with Neville do not appear to have begun before August.

[2] March 2. Being charged by Topcliff, the pursuivant commonly employed in Romish persecutions, with obtaining regicide encouragement from Rome, in Cardinal Como's letter, he said, "You clear mistake it. I deny any such matter to be in the letter; and I wish it might be truly examined and considered of." (Contemporary paper of Burghley's. STRYPE. *Annals.* iii. 362.) He had admitted, however, that "such matter was in the letter," when it was produced on his trial, and he must have professed to understand it so, when he communicated it to Elizabeth and her ministers.

[3] *True and Plain Decl.* 30. STRYPE. *ut supra.*

[4] STRYPE. *ut supra.* Mr. Butler, with the doctors, Milner and Lingard, describe this unhappy person as a Protestant. But this may well be doubted. It is true, that he took the oath of supremacy three times before he went abroad, and again on his taking his seat for Queenborough. He was, most probably too, a professed Protestant while upon the royal household.

As if to augment national enthusiasm, thanksgivings were ordered for the queen's escape, and prayers for her future safety[1]. The Romanists naturally viewed all such appeals as very much against a supply of continental stimulants. They had the satisfaction of observing that the bill for clearing the country of Jesuits and seminary-priests remained long under parliamentary discussion. But still there was always every appearance that it would ultimately pass, and thus increase the danger of any Romish ministrations, but such flat and stale ones as might be rendered by elderly untravelled clergymen, averse from foreign politics. To the uneasy and enterprising spirits, which had more of party than of sectarian feeling, this was a cheerless prospect. Others deprecated it, probably, because by trusting only to domestic resources, English Romanism might be gradually extinguished. While the bill pended, accordingly, an attempt was made to work upon the queen, in a petition of ten pages. This represented Romish absence from church as merely flowing from fear of damnable sin, drew a moving picture of sufferings undergone by recusants, and prayed that no law should pass to banish their priests. Richard Shelley, of a family long seated at Michael Grove, in Sussex, undertook the responsibility of presenting this

---

He speaks of himself, however, as "suspected in religion," and an absentee from the Communion, during twenty-two years. At Paris, he was formally reconciled to Romanism; and at Milan, he offered his orthodoxy to examination by the Inquisition. At execution, he "said the Lord's Prayer in Latin, with other private prayers to himself." Such religion as he had, seems, therefore, to have been Romish. Dr. Milner (*Letter to a Preb.* 168.) mistook his dying admissions as to the reconciliations of Paris and Milan. He did not charge himself with any moral fault in them, but with transgressing by them "a positive law only," that is, a recent act of parliament, which had created a political offence.

[1] Printed at the end of the *True and Plain Declaration.*

petition. It was a service of some danger, because the document ventured upon charges likely to offend persons in authority, and assigned a degree of loyalty to the Romish body, which might cause particular inquiry, as being very generally questioned. Shelley was quickly summoned to substantiate his allegations[1]. He was required to name the parties said to be starved in prison, and whipped, and excessively impoverished, by paying 20*l.* a month; also the priests who acknowledged the queen as lawful sovereign, *tam de jure, quam de facto.* In reply, he named one Temple as starved in Bridewell. He does not appear to have been equally well prepared in the other cases. At length he was asked to subscribe the following passage: "Whosoever, being a born subject of this realm, doth allow that the pope hath any authority to deprive Queen Elizabeth, that now is, of her estate and crown, is a traitor." This, as usual, was met by a shuffle. Shelley declared it hard for him to discuss the pope's authority, and therefore unable to answer any further. He had been previously told, and not unfairly, that, if his party really thought as the petition purported, it ought to put forth an answer to Allen's objectionable positions[2].

---

[1] April 9. Strype. *Annals.* iii. 432.

[2] *Ibid.* "The Catholics, before their doom was sealed by the royal assent, sought to propitiate the queen by a long and eloquent petition. In it, they vindicated their loyalty and their religion from the odious doctrines with which they had been charged. They declared,—1. That all Catholics, both laity and clergy, held her to be their sovereign, as well *de jure*, as *de facto.* 2. That they believed it to be sinful for any person whomsoever to lift up his hand against her, as God's anointed. 3. That it was not in the power of priest or pope to give licence to any man to do, or attempt to do, that which was sinful. And 4. That if such an opinion were held by any one, they renounced him and his opinion, as devilish and abominable, heretical, and contrary to the Catholic faith.

While parliament continued sitting, the ministry gave proof that its object in proposing new penalties against Romish priests, with powers and prejudices from abroad, was merely defensive. A commission under the great seal authorised the deportation of twenty such persons, and one gentleman. Four of the party had been indicted and attainted of high treason. Ten had only been indicted, and seven were in custody on suspicion[1]. In six days, they were all embarked[2], and immediately the vessel sailed for Normandy, where they were set on shore[3], with an understanding that if they should return, their lives would be forfeited. On their passage, they were liberally provided, and kindly treated; every expense being defrayed by the government. Within a few months, thirty-two more were carried over to Boulogne, in the

---

Wherefore they prayed that she would not consider them as disloyal subjects, merely because they abstained, through motives of conscience, from the established service; but would have a merciful consideration of their sufferings, and would refuse her assent to the law which had for its object to banish all Catholic priests out of the realm. This petition was communicated to the chief of the clergy and gentry, and was universally approved. When it was asked who would venture to present it to the queen, Richard Shelley, of Michael Grove, in Sussex, took upon himself the risk, and was made to pay the penalty. The council, for his presumption, committed him to prison; where, after a confinement of several years, he died the victim of his zeal to alleviate the sufferings of his brethren." (LINGARD. viii. 228.) "When Shelley was brought before the council, he was required to reveal the names of those who concurred with him in the petition. Aware of the object, he gave the names of such only as were known recusants. It was then objected, that the petitioners ought to have refuted the arguments of Dr. Allen, in favour of the deposing power: and he was required to sign a paper, declaring that all who held the deposing power were traitors. This he refused."—*Ibid.* note.

[1] Jan. 15. The commission is printed by Mr. Townsend from the State Paper Office. (*Supplementary Letter to C. Butler, Esq.* 74.) Rishton, the Tower diarist, was among the convicts sent away.

[2] Jan. 21. Certificate given by the prisoners, on landing.—FOULIS'S *Romish Treasons.* 327.

[3] Feb. 3.—*Ib.*

same spirit of kindness and liberality[1]. Self-preservation exacted such precautions. By sheltering men, refusing to abjure treason, because they now spoke openly of little or nothing but religion, Elizabeth would have exemplified Esop's dolt, cherishing a paralyzed viper. But she could respect and pity many whom prudence bade her to cast away.

Upon the foreign seminaries all such lenity was lost. A shipload of their friends and members, returned unhurt, was, after all, a mortifying proof of failure. They continued, accordingly, to find constant interest under the wearing tediousness of exile, from political excitement, now become unusually exceptionable. Elizabeth's wisdom and popularity left her enemies no hope, unless ready for assassination. This flagitious expedient came, therefore, often under discussion among men, whose profession rendered argument upon it peculiarly infamous. In the seminary at Rheims, there were some who spoke of the pope's deposing bulls, as inspired by the Holy Ghost. Any crime needful for carrying them into execution, would soon be ranked in such quarters, among religious duties. Others of the Rhemists maintained in print, that prayers, and spiritual arms of every kind, were alone allowable for converting England. For this doctrine, so becoming to a Christian body, the Rhemish college gained, however, no lasting credit. It was quickly branded as a mere blind, employed by artful men to spring upon their victims unawares. Rheims owed this obloquy to John Savage, an indigent mercenary soldier, of obscure origin, reputed illegitimate, who had served in Philip's army.

---

[1] Embarked, Sept. 15, landed, Sept. 19. Certificate of the prisoners, on landing. (STOWE. 709.) Rishton says that there were fifty, but he was not of the party.

Coming to Rheims, a needy, desperate adventurer, his passions were easily so inflamed, in this bigoted and anti-English school, as to engender a fanatical disposition for murdering the queen. In this flagitious disposition he was confirmed at Paris, by Dr. William Gifford, eventually archbishop of Rheims; but still his mind wavered[1]. It is said to have been finally fixed upon the guilty enterprise by a Jesuit with whom he met at Eu[2]. He now talked of himself as bound by vow to assassinate Elizabeth.

While brooding over this enormity, he came into contact with John Ballard, a Rhemish seminary priest, who was returned to France from an English tour in disguise, among the wealthy recusants. His object had not merely been religious. He sought means for revolutionising England, under Spanish auspices, and with the sanguine vision of adventure, he thought himself to have met with decisive success. When again on continental ground, he laid his views and information before Allen; who gave them a most unsatisfactory reception, strongly dissuading him from the prosecution of such a purpose[3]. But Ballard merely heard these chilling arguments with civility. He soon found one who both listened and applauded. This was Thomas Morgan, joint-administrator of her French dowry, for Mary, queen of Scots, and now a prisoner in the Bastile[4]. With him, a new plot was concocted, and measures were concerted for carrying it into immediate execution. Conspirators, however, are driven for confederates to the desperate and unprincipled. Ballard, accordingly, had received important aid from a confidant, named Maude. But this was a spy of Walsingham's, paid for betraying him. Thus he, and Savage, had no sooner landed in England[1], than every one of their movements was accurately known to the Secretary of State. The betrayed Rhemist called himself Captain Fortescue, and had evidently considerable command of money. He appeared in a gold-laced cloak, velvet hose, cut-satin doublet, and a most fashionable hat, with silver-buttoned band. He moved about also with a man and boy in attendance upon him[2]. This gay exterior was fitted for the circle in which he mixed. Morgan gave him an introduction to Anthony Babington, a young, wealthy, and accomplished gentleman of Dethick, in Derbyshire, but often in London, and a free partaker of its pleasures. Being a Romanist, he had gone over secretly to Paris, without license, and Morgan, filling him with expectation from the queen of Scots, had used his assistance in corresponding with her. Ballard easily brought him over to approve of revolutionising England, by the aid of Spain, but he found him obstinately sceptical as to the feasibility of such a plan, so long as Elizabeth lived. He was then told to think nothing of that obstacle, a gentleman being at hand, under vow to assassinate her. Savage, probably, had not hitherto been introduced, his dress being such as to cut off hope of a near approach to the queen, and equally, therefore, to unfit him for fashionable company. Babington, however, not only supplied him with means of making a better appearance, but also expressed himself unable to bear the thought of trusting such a noble enterprise to the hazard of a single hand[1].

---

[1] CAMBDEN. 515.

[2] *Full and Round Answer.* 209.

[3] "I heard Dr. Allen say, that he had dissuaded Ballard, who had revealed the matter unto him, with all the earnest persuasions he could." Confession of James Yong, Jesuit, taken 1592.—STRYPE. *Annals.* iv. 140.

[4] *Ib.* Paget was joined with Morgan in administering Mary's French affairs. As Morgan had long been the centre of intrigues against English tranquillity, Elizabeth wished to have him delivered up. The king of France refused, but imprisoned him, and sent his papers to the queen. Dr. Lingard thinks that revenge now quickened his treasonable activity.

---

[1] At Whitsuntide.—CAMBDEN. 515.

[2] TURNER'S *Elizabeth*. 438.

He now entered himself warmly into the project of assassination, and sought accomplices in the gay young men of fortune who partook of his amusements. But, however prompt for a drunken frolic, or even for a discussion of Romish hardships, they shrank from plans of murder and treason[2]. At length, finding him at once resolved, and irretrievably compromised, rather a chivalrous willingness to share his danger, than cordial approbation, drove them into the conspiracy. Even this participancy was not the same with all of them; some being little further implicated than concealing a guilty knowledge. One of the party, named Pooley, was retained as a government spy, and he transmitted information of every movement. Walsingham, accordingly, watched without uneasiness, and would have waited for some decisive opening. But when their plans approached maturity, he communicated them to the queen. Her natural alarm would suffer the conspiracy to proceed no longer. It would be, she said, presumptuously tempting Providence; and Ballard was arrested[3]. His accomplices took the first opportunity to flee, but one only made good his escape[4]. In all, fourteen of these unhappy persons were put upon their trial, in two parties of seven each[5]. The first seven pleaded guilty, the second set was convicted, chiefly on admissions of their friends. In the same two parties, they were executed[1]; the first with a revolting barbarity that outdid all the frightful botcheries of this reign. The queen herself interposed to prevent a repetition of this inhuman spectacle, and on the next day, mutilation was not suffered, until life was quite extinct. Independently of a morbid appetite for such horrid scenes, the populace was wild with rage against these wretched sufferers, and with exultation at their sovereign's deliverance. The detected conspiracy was no sooner known, than bonfires blazed, bells rang, and festal boards were spread in every quarter[2]. To lighten the blow upon Romanism, Jesuitic impudence promptly named Walsingham as contriver of all the plot[3].

---

[1] Cambden. 515.

[2] "Of whom went report in the Strand, Fleet-street, and elsewhere about London, but of Babington and Tichborne? No threshold was of force to brave our entry." —Tichborne on his trial: *apud* Turner. 439.

[3] Cambden. 517.

[4] Edward Windsor, brother of Lord Windsor.

[5] Sept. 13, and Sept. 14.—Cambden. 518.

As the unhappy queen of Scots was implicated in this conspiracy, her death by judicial violence was immediately considered fairly attainable[4]. It had been proposed by no less a personage, than Sandys, then bishop of London, when stunned by the recent massacre of St. Bartholomew's day[5]. Protestants generally, after that all but incredible ebullition of sanguinary bigotry, must have dreaded a frightful recoil should Mary's accession transfer power from themselves to their opponents. But every year augmented national uneasiness from the captive queen. Hers was the miserable position that found a centre both for domestic discontent, and foreign hostility. Upon her gloomy prison, Elizabeth's ministers were driven by stern necessity to keep an eye, watchful as that of mythologic Argus. In fulfilling this painful duty, their expedients often revolted public feeling. Forged letters, apparently from Mary, or some exile in her interest, were left mysteriously at Romish houses. Tales and rumours, likely to elicit indiscreet remarks, were industriously circulated. Spies roamed about in quest of information for the government[1]. The depressed party, harassed by this tortuous policy, naturally charged it upon political and sectarian hatred[2]. But men in power are not likely to keep ingenuity thus upon the stretch, unless they know themselves to be menaced with real danger. Ample justification was given to strong precautions in this case, by the conspiracies that publicly transpired. Popular impatience under existing circumstances was also inflamed by indications of a less decided character. Philip Howard, earl of Arundel, the most highly-born of English peers, had been taken at sea, clandestinely fleeing to the continent, and was languishing in prison[3]. Henry Percy, earl of Northumberland, had lately shot himself in the Tower, where he was detained upon suspicion[1]. While

---

[1] Sept. 20, and Sept. 21. In St. Giles's Fields, where they had commonly met.—CAMBDEN. 518.

[2] *Ibid.* 517.

[3] "Hereunto we might add the notable treasons of Mr. Anthony Babington, and his complices, in the year 1586, which were so apparent, as we were greatly abashed at the shameless boldness of a young Jesuit, who, to excuse the said traitors, and qualifie their offences, presumed in a kind of supplication to her Majesty, to ascribe the plotting of all that mischief to Mr. Secretary Walsingham."—*Important Considerations.* 71.

[4] "There are in the State-Paper Office whole folios full of ciphered and deciphered correspondence, which is most closely connected together, runs into the minutest particulars, agrees in remote allusions, is responded to in all parts of the world."—VON RAUMER'S *Contributions to Modern History.* Lond. 1836. p. 312.

[5] Bishop of London to Lord Burghley. Sept. 5, 1572. ELLIS'S *Original Letters.* Second Series. iii. 25.

---

[1] Cambden. 497. *sub an.* 1584.

[2] The recusants charged their troubles upon the "subtle artifices of Leicester and Walsingham."—*Ibid.*

[3] He was eldest son of Thomas Howard, last duke of Norfolk, attainted in 1572, by his first wife, Mary Fitz-Alan, daughter, and eventually sole heir of Henry Fitz-Alan, dead in 1579, earl of Arundel. He took his seat in the House of Lords, as earl of Arundel, Jan. 16, 1581, and a bill to restore him in blood, passed that house on the 10th of March following, the Commons, on the 14th, receiving the royal assent on the 18th. He was at first favourably noticed by the queen, but rapidly

---

fell under the temptations of rank and opulence. He lived apart from his wife, Anne, daughter of Lord Dacre, cohabited with some other female, and involved himself irrecoverably in debt. Alienated by such dissipated habits, his grandfather, Lord Arundel, and his aunt, Lady Lumley, left much of their fortunes away from him. Difficulty and immorality being the great inlets to turbulent politics, Arundel soon fell under suspicion, and was arrested. Nothing could be proved against him, but while in confinement, he determined upon identifying himself completely with the Romish party by sending for a missionary, and being formally reconciled to the Papal Church. He attributed his conversion to the reading of Campion's *Ten Reasons*. His education, like his father's, had been Protestant. He had not, therefore, even lived, like the steadier English Romanists, a disciple of his country's grave nonconforming priests. Even if he had no sinister object in adopting the continental principles, that measure must have rendered him additionally suspicious at home, and he determined upon a foreign residence. Before his departure, April, 1585, he wrote a long, querulous letter to the queen, in which, as a specimen of it, he set up a sort of evasive claim of innocence, for his weak and unfortunate father. Being intercepted, he never recovered his liberty, although he lived until 1595. His life might have been taken, as he was convicted in 1589, being then about thirty-three years, of treasonable communications with Cardinal Allen, Persons, and other conspirators. It was a very slight case, but his position made him a dangerous man. After his first troubles, he returned to the cohabitation of his wife, but this, Dr. Lingard says, the queen did not suffer to continue long. He also tells us in a note, "that the Queen was surrounded by women of the most dissolute character, and that for a married man to aspire to the royal favour, it was previously requisite that he should be upon evil terms with his wife." The authority for these charges is a MS. *Life of Philippe Howard*, belonging to the duke of Norfolk. That a family which suffered so severely under Elizabeth should possess, and even credit such MSS. is natural enough. But people generally require better authority for improbable and shameful imputations, than scandal recorded in the unpublished papers of some anonymous scribe, and treasured up by a house that can hardly fail of remembering resentfully the parties maligned.—NICOLAS'S *Synopsis of the Peerage.* i. 28. D'EWES. 267. 272. 300. STRYPE. *Annals.* iii. 454. CAMBDEN. 552. LINGARD. viii. 232. BARTOLI. 184.

[1] June 20, 1585. He was charged as an accomplice in Throgmorton's conspiracy, and it is at least clear, that he had allowed Charles Paget, while personating Mr. Mope, to meet Lord Paget, at his house at Petworth. They

Babington's conspiracy was in progress, Persons, the Jesuit, had been secretly travelling in England[1]. Mary herself, it was discovered, had become involved in the ambitious projects of Spain. She had not only approved of an invasion by Philip, but also expressed an intention to make his family her heir, in case of her own son's perseverance as a Protestant[2]. Thus the name of that miserable queen became hateful to every class of Englishmen, unimbued with Romish prejudice. Men eagerly longed for her death as their only release from intolerable suspense and anticipation.

Whether such release was regularly within legal reach, is probably, disputable. It would, however, obviously be dangerous to teach, that persons, detained in a country, even against their wills, are not amenable to its laws[3]. None would hear of such a doctrine, if a case arose involving individual property or life. It is not, however, reasonable, that a sovereign should have less protection than a subject. Nor if Mary's object had been gained, either by an assassin's hand, or Spanish cannon, would injury to life and property have rested with Elizabeth.

---

were said to be conferring about a settlement of the family property. The coroner's inquest brought in Northumberland *felo-de-se*, but some of the exiles talked of him as murdered by the contrivance of Hatton. Sir Walter Raleigh countenanced this report, in 1601. (CAMBDEN. 504. STOWE. 706. LINGARD. viii. 238.) Bridgewater labours to make it seem impossible that Northumberland could have destroyed himself. (206.) No other solution of his death is, however, probable.

[1] Persons to Allen, July 25, 1586. STRYPE. *Annals*. iii. Append. XII. p. 418. Mary wrote to him a letter of concurrence in Philip's designs, May 21, 1586.—VON RAUMER'S *Contributions to Modern History*. 304.

[2] "If my son should not become a Catholic, I intend to leave the kingdom by will to King Philip, as the weal of Christendom requires it."—Mary, Queen of Scots, to Charles Paget. May 21, 1586. *Ibid.*

[3] "Instances have occurred very recently in England, when prisoners of war have suffered death for criminal offences."—HALLAM. *Const. Hist.* i. 217.

Those who hate her memory most, will readily allow that suffering and death must then have lighted on many unoffending heads. Mary, therefore, by listening to Babington and Spain, had clearly threatened insecurity to every fire-side, however humble. Yet her dismissal was impossible. In any other country, she was likely to be found more dangerous, than in that which was driven to detain her. It cannot be wondered, that England, in a choice of evils, should have brought her to trial, as a sojourning offender against its peace[1]. It might have been wiser to take a different course, and merely subject her to closer restraint. But this could have hardly have been done, without some solemn investigation, substantially a criminal trial. To such proceedings the age could see no terminations but either an acquittal, or a sanguinary sentence. There does not appear to have been any reasonable prospect of the former. The latter clearly should never have been executed. Its execution[2] has foully blemished Elizabeth's reputation. It was cruel thus to cut off a female, a relative, a prisoner, and a queen. The persecution of Davison is an aggravation of this discreditable case. Elizabeth might not be thoroughly resolved upon Mary's death, but she must have more than half intended it, and have felt it as a great deliverance. Her unrelenting severity to its official instrument, a statesman of unquestionable honour, was to heap one cruelty upon another, and to brand her name with an imputation of remorseless duplicity[3].

---

[1] Oct. 14.

[2] Feb. 8, 1587.

[3] He was fined ten thousand marks, and he was to be imprisoned during the queen's pleasure. It is uncertain how long he was detained, but the fine ruined him. It appears from a letter to the queen that he was at large, Dec. 7, 1590. He died at Stepney towards the end of 1608.—NICOLAS's *Life of William Davison.* Lond. 1823. pp. 195. 200.

While Mary's fate remained in suspense, L'Aubespine, the French ambassador, a violent Guisian partisan, was tampering with an English traitor for the assassination of Elizabeth. His intrigue being detected, he could give no better apology to Burghley, than that he was bound to communicate whatever came to his knowledge in England, to no other court than his own[1]. Such a flimsy pretence could satisfy no one, but the conduct which it hoped to screen was alike injurious to the royal captive, and to Romish credit. The latter soon received farther damage from a painful occurrence in the Netherlands. Rowland York, a dissolute, ruffianly Londoner, had gone over to serve in the Dutch wars, under Leicester. Some quarrel with that vain and inefficient leader, gave the mercenary bully a pretext for transferring his services to the other side. He had now an opportunity of finding a new customer in his own country, whose banners he had basely deserted, and Leicester thought it worth while to buy him back. He made him governor of a fort near Zutphen. York thus became fitter than ever for going to market. His own station might be of no great importance, but a neighbouring commander, Sir William Stanley, an officer distinguished in the Irish wars, was left in charge of Deventer, a strong and wealthy town. Unhappily for his own fame, and that of his religion, he was a staunch Romanist. York plied him with sophistry not only to take hold of prejudice, but even also to awaken apprehension. He persuaded him that his return home would infallibly consign him to a gibbet, as an accomplice in Babington's conspiracy. Stanley's bigotry enticed him into this miserable trap, and he perfidiously betrayed Deventer to the enemy, under the paltry pretence, that he was only restoring it to its rightful owner. Among his men, who, with York's, were thirteen hundred in all, were some Irish, and probably, the whole body was pretty much of his own opinion, as to religion. Having plunged himself inextricably in this infamy, he sought a gilding for it from fanaticism. Allen gloried in a seminary which was to storm English Protestantism, by an ecclesiastical invasion of papal myrmidons. Stanley would emulate his fame, and organise a religious troop, to second Jesuits and Seminarists in their missionary zeal, by fighting, instead of reconciling. Allen heard of the fanatical deserter's project with delight, and sent him immediately a detachment of priests, to train his men in a belief, that service in the army of an excommunicated heretic could only be terminated with honour and spiritual safety according to the traitorous fashion adopted by themselves[1]. Philip could wish nothing better than the dissemination of such notions in the ranks of his enemy. Hence Allen's prompt assistance was, probably, not forgotten, when the cardinal's hat and archbishop's mitre, which soon after alighted on his brows, came within reasonable distance. But a preaching captain, and a legion of crusaders, deserters all besides, were commodities of much more questionable value. Stanley's fighting seminary came, accordingly, to nothing. The misguided and dishonoured officer himself lived some years a despised and neglected pensioner of Spain[2]. His tempter, York, was poisoned, and, after an interment of three years, his body was dug up by the States, and gibbeted[3]. But before justice thus overtook the principal offenders, their offence both heaped new obloquy upon English Romanism, and gave it a fresh taint of venom. Its more zealous opponents charged it with rendering men unworthy to be trusted. Some of its friends advocated implicit obedience to the pope, if a sovereign were excommunicated, maintaining that a subject had only then to think of a fitting time for turning round, and trampling on allegiance[1].

---

[1] CAMBDEN. 532.

---

[1] CAMBDEN. 540. STRYPE. *Annals.* iii. 622.

[2] STRYPE. *Annals.* iv. 389.

[3] CAMBDEN. 540.

---

[1] "The treachery also of Sir William Standley, the year following, 1587, in falsifying his faith to her Majesty, and in betraying the trust committed unto him by the Earl of Leicester, who had given him the honourable title of knighthood: as it was greatly prejudicial to us, that were Catholics, at home, so was the defence of that disloyalty, (made by a worthy man, but by the persuasions, as they think, of Parsons) greatly disliked of many both wise and learned. And especially it was wondered at a while (until the drift thereof appeared more manifestly in the year 1588) that the said worthy person by the said lewd Jesuits, laid down this for a ground, in justifying of the said Standley: *viz. That in all wars which may happen for religion, every Catholick man is bound in conscience to imploy his person and forces by the Pope's direction: viz. how far, when, and where, either at home, or abroad, he may and must break with his temporal sovereign.* These things we would not have touched, had they not been known in effect to this part of the world, and that we thought it our duties to shew our own dislike of them, and to clear her Majesty so far as we may, from such imputations of more than barbarous cruelty towards us, as the Jesuits in their writings have cast by heaps upon her: they themselves, as we still think in our consciences, and before God, having been from time to time the very causes of all the calamities which any of us have endured in England since her Majesties reign." (*Important Considerations.* 72.) "During his absence" (Leicester's) "dissension and faction introduced themselves into the army in Holland. If many approved, many also condemned the execution of the Scottish queen. Elizabeth was branded as the murderess of the rightful heir of the crown, and emissaries were artfully employed to debauch the fidelity of the soldiers. Among the officers was Sir Roland York, a soldier of fortune, and captain of a fort near Zutphen, who, for some former offence, dreaded the secret resentment of Leicester. This man took the opportunity to insinuate to Sir William Stanley, governor of Daventer, that he, as the friend of Babington, and advocate of Mary, was an object of suspicion to the council, and was destined to suffer, at a convenient time, a similar fate. Stanley caught the alarm: he assembled the garrison, and declared that his conscience forbade him to fight in the cause of rebels against their sovereign; that Daventer belonged to the king of Spain; and that it was the duty of every honest man to restore to the right owner that property

The Romish controversy, in its earlier stages, had an unhappy tendency to thrust Protestants upon a sanguinary zeal for orthodoxy. While those who dissented from Rome were known to hold every doctrine that she had herself received from the first four general councils, a strong claim for the candid consideration of reformed opinions, was evidently made upon the more thinking of her adherents. Protestant acquiescence in the church's earliest known decisions, was represented, accordingly, as a mere delusion[1]. Men were taught to regard papal authority as the only protection against a wild latitudinarian spirit, utterly careless of everything stamped with antiquity. As unbridled license of private judgment had really no encouragement either in principle or practice from those who broke the chains of Italian bondage, such misrepresentation occasioned some ebullitions of dis-

---

which had been unjustly acquired. They applauded his harangue: both Daventer and the fort were surrendered, and Stanley and York, with 1300 men, entered into the service of Philip." (LINGARD. viii. 313.) A note below contains the following matter from Persons. "That Daventer had been surprised against the will of the inhabitants by Sir William Stanley, who was sworn to keep it for the States: that both Stanley and Leicester were enemies to Sir John Norris, who succeeded to the command on the departure of Leicester; and on this account, the latter left with Stanley a written license to leave the service at any moment he might think proper. Hence Persons contended that Stanley was no deserter, because he had license to depart; that he was no traitor to Elizabeth, because he was in the States; and that he was guilty of no injustice, because the town was the property of the king of Spain, and, as he had been instrumental in taking it from its right owner, he was bound in conscience to restore it to him."

[1] "Nor have we to do with the Arians, or Anabaptists, or Servetus, or Gentilis, or any heretikes. Nay, by our doctors these fellows have bene diligently confuted, and by our governors the principall of them have bene punished." (*Full and Round Answer.* 14.) Persons "affirmeth that Servetus was Calvin's collegue, and that he and Valentinus Gentilis, and other heretikes, came from Calvin and Beza." (*Ibid.* 303.) "He doeth also match us with Arians, and other sects, which we detest."—*Ibid.* 349.

graceful and revolting intolerance. It became a point of honour and conscience to preserve an unimpaired hostility for every principle that unsuspected antiquity had certainly condemned. Three instances in which England had foully vindicated herself from any tenderness for heterodoxy, have been already mentioned in this volume. Two more remain for notice. Norwich has the infamy of both. John Lewis was burnt there, in 1583, for denying the divinity of Christ, and other errors [1]. Five years afterward, the same wretched fate overtook, in the same place, Francis Kett, a master of arts, and probably a clergyman. In addition to unsound opinions upon the Saviour's person, with which he is reasonably charged, he is known to have broached some fanatical conceits upon a visible reign of Christ in the Holy Land [2]. His case was the last in which Elizabeth's government answered reflections upon its Catholicity by fire and fagot. Five such replies now appear a shameful proof of inhumanity and folly. But contemporaries took a very different view. Both Churchmen and Puritans were fully agreed as to the necessity of thus wiping

---

[1] Sept. 17. STOWE. 697.

[2] "Of this number" (false prophets) "I may verie well account the late obstinate heretike, Francis Ket, who was, within these two months, brent at Norwich. All the places in the prophets which did describe the spiritual kingdom of Christ, he applied to the materiall restauration of Jerusalem; affirming that as many as would be saved, must go and dwell there in the land of Chanaan." (*Sermon preached at Paule's Crosse, Feb.* 9, 1588, by R. BANCROFT, D.D. Lond. 1588. p. 8.) Stowe merely charges him with "holding divers detestable opinions against Christ, our Saviour." An extract from a letter of October 7, written by Edmund Scambler, bishop of Norwich, who condemned this unfortunate man, does no more than speak of his "blasphemous opinions." (STRYPE. *Annals.* iii. pt. 2. p. 73.) Unless his doctrine could be proved contrary to that of the first four general councils, it does not appear that he could suffer as a heretic consistently with the act of the queen's first year.—TWISDEN'S *Historical Vindication.* 173.

Romish aspersions away, and following Scripture in the punishment of blasphemy.

Recent prosecutions were strikingly vindicated by Philip's famed *Armada*. News of his preparations had been sent from Switzerland eight years ago[1], but nothing was done to awaken serious apprehension until within the last five years[2]. During that space, the Spanish monarchy was known to be straining every nerve for some mighty effort. Rumour occasionally pitched upon the Netherlands as a theatre for this grand explosion. But persons of good information knew England to be the sullen bigot's aim. Two years, accordingly, before his gallant navy proudly sailed, English preachers were instructed from authority to prepare their hearers for the coming storm[3]. The enemy also sought religious aid. Felix Peretti, once a peasant, now Pope Sixtus V., renewed the libellious, anti-social bulls of his infatuated predecessors. Allen, lately made cardinal, clothed in approving English, this fresh justification of his country's laws against imported papal emissaries[4]. The thriving Englishman's new purple being thus begrimed, his patrons could not rest until he had soiled it indelibly all over. They made him find face to play the foul-mouthed traitor, and in print. His best friends were thunderstruck to see one so smooth and plausible, come forward with *An Admonition to the Nobility and People of England and Ireland*,—a low, treasonable, virulent appeal to his countrymen, in favour of the Spanish invasion[1]. But before this adhesive infamy to his name had gotten largely into circulation, the labouring mountain had brought forth its mouse, and Allen grew fretful to recover a position of tolerable decency. The pamphlet itself was carefully suppressed, and consequently rendered extremely scarce[1]; but extracts from it abound, effectually blasting the pamphleteer's reputation. He had, however, egregiously miscalculated in acting the scurrilous incendiary. His country spurned such *Admonition*. English blood rose almost everywhere, immeasurably above the baseness of betraying home, and cringing to the tender mercies of invading aliens. Some cowardly, half-principled alarmists whispered in the queen's ear that policy required her to seek a colourable pretence for cutting off the leading Romanists, before Philip's fleet approached[2].

---

[1] Cox, bishop of Ely, to the Lord Treasurer. June 18. 1580. Rod. Gualter to Archbishop Grindal. — STRYPE. *Annals.* Append. XXVII. XXVIII. pp. 672, 673.

[2] TURNER'S *Elizabeth.* 472. LINGARD. viii. 322. The latter historian says, "During this interval, the conduct of Elizabeth had not been calculated to avert his resentment" (Philip's). "She had sent to the relief of the Belgian insurgents an English army under a general, who assumed the title and authority of governor of the revolted provinces; and after a trial, unprecedented in the annals of Europe, she had taken on a scaffold the life of the Queen of Scots." No doubt Elizabeth had done these things, and other such, during these five years, in discharge of her public trust, and in defence of her own life. But Philip, though mortified of course, had no right to complain. It had been shown that he was mixed up with all the dangers that menaced England and her queen.

[3] STOWE. 742.

[4] "He did it by a small pamphlet, intituled, *The Declaration of the Sentence of Sixtus Quintus.*" —BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* iii. 210.

---

[1] It brands Elizabeth as a bastard, born in incest, of an infamous courtesan, who was connected criminally with her own brother and father; as perjured, profane; a destroyer of ancient nobility, a raiser of base, impure spies, traitors, slanderers, and suborners, on its ruins; as affording refuge to atheists, anabaptists, heretics, and rebels of all nations; as a plunderer of her people; as venal, for the sake of enriching her own "poor cousins and favourites. Among the latter is Leicester, whom she took up first to serve her own filthy lust: whereof to have more freedom and interest, he hath caused his own wife to be murdered, as afterwards for the accomplishment of the like brutish pleasures with another noble dame, it is openly known that he made away with her husband;" as "having abused her body, not only with the aforesaid person, but also with divers others;" as "a common fable for her turpitude, causing the whole world to deride the effeminate dastardie that has allowed such a creature to reign over both body and soul for thirty years together; as not marrying, because she cannot confine herself to one man." Other specimens, much of the same kind, may be seen in Dr. Lingard, (Note BB. viii. 535,) whence these are taken. He adds, "The author of this most offensive tract seems to have studied the works, and to have acquired the style of the exiles, who formerly, at Geneva, published libels against Queen Mary, the predecessor of Elizabeth." (Did Knox and Goodman, with all their puritanical violence, coarsely stigmatise Mary as a Messalina?) "Who that author was, soon became a subject of discussion. The language and manner certainly are not like those of Allen, in his acknowledged works; and the appellant priests boldly asserted that the book was *penned altogether by the advice of F. Persons*. Persons himself, though he twice notices the charge, seems, by his evasions, to acknowledge its truth. But whoever were the real author, the cardinal, by subscribing his name, adopted the tract for his own, and thus became answerable for its contents." Allen was to have been legate, like Cardinal Pole, and his advancement to a red hat is said to have been "against his will." Having conquered that repugnance, he certainly was not slow in showing himself a man to conquer every other. The appellant secular priests lay the whole blame of his altered character

---

upon the Jesuits, by whom, they say, he "was seduced and brought into dishonourable actions against prince, country, and friends."—*A Reply to a notorious Libell, intituled, a Briefe Apologie of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchie.* 1603. p. 147.

[1] "A numerous edition was printed at Antwerp to be distributed in England at the moment of the invasion: but the invasion did not take place, and care was taken to burn almost all the copies." (LINGARD. *ubi supra.*) The secular priests not only attributed Allen's discreditable figure to the Jesuits, but also his preferment, thus making it the wages of infamy.—*Reply to a notorious Libell.* 148.

[2] "Several of the ministers began to look on the massacre of St. Bartholomew as a useful precedent: and had it not been for the humanity of the queen herself, the chief of the Catholics, those most distinguished by birth and property, would have been immolated to the jealousy of their adversaries. The expedient of a counterfeit plot was suggested: but Elizabeth rejected the barbarous advice, and as no trace of any disloyal project could be discovered, refused to dip her hands in innocent blood." (LINGARD. viii. 331.) These appear rather hasty assumptions, the only authority cited being Cambden, from whom a Latin passage stands below. But this makes no mention of "ministers." In fact, that which relates to the advisers, has no nominative case. The English Cambden thus supplies one. "Some beat it many times into the queen's head." The parties might be, therefore, and most probably were, no ministers at all

But Elizabeth knew her people to be incapable of belying confidence in their spirit, steadiness, and integrity. A few recusants, but none of eminence, were sent prisoners to Wisbeach Castle[1]. The great body was merely viewed as one section in an united, patriotic mass, that would nobly do its duty. Like most of the queen's views, this proved a wise one. Romanists kept emulously abreast of Protestants in echoing defiance from shore to shore. Papal writers urge this picture as a triumphant refutation of the injurious charges fastened on their party. But surely men might think their country's religious choice unfortunate, without any disposition to sacrifice her independence. The English ear must be degenerate indeed, which sectarian prejudice could close against an urgent call for moral vigour. And what really religious mind could mingle aspirations after heaven with Spanish politics? What plain understanding could feel assured of property, or even life, if an invading army were

---

and their suggestions, Cambden says, were not founded upon the St. Bartholomew, but upon Henry VIII.'s judicial tyranny towards the marquess of Exeter and some others. There appears to have been actually an unusual number of prosecutions for Romish offences in the year 1588. Thirty-six recusants are said to have suffered capitally. But nothing is accurately known of their cases. —*Fierie Tryall of God's Saints.* Lond. 1612.

[1] Cambden. 544. "Under the plea of precaution, all recusants-convict were placed in custody, a return of *persons suspected for religion* was required from the magistrates of the capital, in several counties, perhaps in all, domiciliary searches were made: crowds of Catholics of both sexes, and of every rank, were dragged to the common jails throughout the kingdom." (Lingard. viii. 331.) Thus the Romanists were not unanimously patriotic; for it is not likely that the government would have chosen to irritate them rashly, on the eve of a very serious danger. Philip Howard, too, the unfortunate earl of Arundel, was charged upon his trial with having had a mass said for the success of the *Armada*. He rebutted this charge, by saying that he was only praying against a massacre that he heard was intended for the Romanists.—Cambden. 553.

marching through the land? Common fame, indeed, made Philip's commander say, that pleas of religion must be disregarded, and nothing thought of, but a secure establishment for his master[1]. Again, many who rejected Protestantism, looked upon the Jesuits and reconciling Seminarists from abroad, as pernicious intruders. They were contented with secret ministrations by clergymen left from Mary's reign, and untaught in foreign schools. To these venerable sufferers for conscience' sake, recent legislative severities did not apply, and they freely admitted them to have been far from unprovoked. Their professional services, accordingly, had no base political alloy, no unpatriotic taint. Even correspondents of Romish exiles had latterly received sounder views than heretofore. When individuals who had laboured zealously in the papal cause were found labouring with equal zeal to make England a province of Spain, some of their former friends, though steadfast in religion, immediately seceded from their party. This honourable course was taken by Paget and Morgan, formerly French agents to the late queen of Scots. These gentlemen became resolute opponents of the Jesuits, and other political adepts in abusing the confessional[2]. So many counteracting causes gave not a chance to Allen, or to any other partisan of Rome, intent upon fusing bigotry into treason.

The inherent vitality of religious feeling and human hope, was proof against Philip's discomfiture. Still the Jesuits and Seminarists did not despair of England.

---

[1] "It is well known that the duke of Medina Sidonia had given it out directly, that if once he might land in England, *both Catholicks and hereticks that came in his way, should be all one to him: his sword could not discern them: so he might make way for his master, all was one to him.*"—*Important Considerations.* 73.

[2] BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* iii. 223.

They did not even abandon their favourite line of secular politics. As James of Scotland seemed likely to confirm the promise of an education strictly Protestant, they formed a Spanish party to exclude him from the succession. These dreamers talked of Philip's title to the crown, as legally inherited from the House of Lancaster. Continental supporters, probably, expected some unpatriotic scheme at an English college. Nor could a missionary calculate upon a cordial welcome everywhere at home, if recommended by no views that were not purely spiritual. Romish opinions had been retained by a wealthy body of men, who transferred power and patronage, by that very circumstance, to opponents of far inferior hereditary pretensions. Human nature, thus despoiled, only rises, when deeply serious, above an anxiety to recover the regretted ground. A papal party was really necessary to the survival of a Romish sect. Under Elizabeth's refrigerating policy, this must have ultimately disappeared, had not inflammatory matter been smuggled in from abroad. Clergymen, on the edge of another world, were not likely to distract hearers, commonly of their own standing, with much that bore a character merely sectarian. Hence modern English Romanism owes its existence to the influx of Jesuits and Seminarists. Without these importations, which gave just offence to more pious contemporaries of their own communion[1], England would soon have become free from Romish families. This obvious fact requires attention, as does also Elizabeth's connivance at secret Romish ministrations by priests unconnected with organised societies or foreign institutions. It is true, that any religious rites but those of the Established Church, were prohibited, and that absence from these was finable. Recusants, however, made regular compositions for such fines, which became a constant, though discreditable, branch of the royal revenue. If the compounders, then, would abstain from using in their secret worship the services of ecclesiastics from abroad, the illegal mass was not likely to be molested. Such a measure of intolerance was far from creditable to the government, or perhaps rather to the age, but it was not so oppressive as people commonly suppose. Nor was the prohibition of missionaries from abroad by any means indefensible. These returned Englishmen, generally very young, came imbued with doctrines known as *ultramontane*. But such extravagant, insulting, and pernicious estimates of papal authority, even Romish Europe generally, without the Alps, has deliberately rejected. They came, too, with such principles, when Rome was eagerly bent upon making them no dead letter. Pius V. had furnished Ridolfi with money to raise a civil war in England. Gregory XIII. had pretended to dispose of Ireland, appearing there as a hostile temporal prince. When Philip was preparing the *Armada*, Sixtus V. promised him a million of crowns immediately that news of a descent upon England should arrive at Rome[1]. All three had issued formal documents with a view of perverting prejudice into treason, and of paving the way for alien enemies to conquer Elizabeth's dominions. Men, instructed in such principles, must solemnly renounce them, before they could recover their paternal rights. Hence a Jesuist, or Seminarist, unprepared for a manly, Christian-like recantation of the deposing power, had no claim to re-admission into the bosom of his country. To receive him, would, indeed, be suicidal. Yet, even had the age admitted of toleration with trustworthy ministers, it would, probably, have been found impossible to continue a supply of Romish priests, uninfected by that ultramontane poison which England fairly repelled, as insulting to her independence, and inconsistent with her safety.

---

[1] "The old Lord Mountacute's conceit was marvellous, both Catholike and loyall, against these new state religious Jesuits: whose singularity he utterly disliking of, together with their busie practises and intrusions, would never suffer any of them to come within his dores, neither yet any other Seminarie priest; all such being wrongfully suspected of a Jesuiticall disposition, from which many were from the beginning most free, though some, and those too many, were infected by them."—WATSON. *Quodlibets.* 263.

---

[1] "The count" (Olivarez) "took great pains to prevail upon the pope to disburse one-half of this money immediately; and the duke of Parma sent count Sesis to Rome for the same purpose; but all their arguments and persuasions were thrown away upon him, for he continued firm, and would not part with a crown till the time

proposed." (FARNEWORTH. *Life of Pope Sixtus V.* Dubl. 1779. p. 486.) The selfish caution of Sixtus may make his hostility to England seem really illusory. But he sought to fire the resentful bigotry of Philip, by appealing to his title of *Catholic Majesty*, in an autograph letter, "which is reckoned a prodigious favour," and he would, probably, have made considerable sacrifices to invade Elizabeth, if there had been the least prospect of a return for the outlay.

CHAPTER VI.

PROGRESS OF DISCIPLINARIAN PURITANISM.

1588—1594.

PURITANICAL BIAS AT THE COUNCIL-BOARD—ARCHBISHOP WHITGIFT—MAR-PRELATE—COUNTER PUBLICATIONS—NEW PARLIAMENT- PLURALITIES—BANCROFT'S SERMON AT ST. PAUL'S CROSS—DISCIPLINARIAN ORGANIZATION—NEW ARREST OF CARTWRIGHT—CHARGES AGAINST HIM—UDAL—CAWDREY'S CASE—HACKET'S OUTRAGE—LIBERATION AND RETIREMENT OF CARTWRIGHT—ILLEGALITY ATTRIBUTED TO PROCEEDINGS AGAINST PURITANISM—THE OATH EX OFFICIO—TAKEN IN SOME CASES—SUBSCRIPTION IRREGULARLY ENFORCED—NEW PARLIAMENT—PURITANICAL MOVEMENTS ARBITRARILY REPRESSED—STATUTE AGAINST PROTESTANT RECUSANCY—BARROW AND GREENWOOD—CONDEMNED AND EXECUTED AS FELONS—PENRY—BARROWISM HOSTILE TO UNRESTRICTED TOLERATION—ROMISH CONFORMITY OF HENRY IV.—SPANISH PARTY AMONG ENGLISH ROMANISTS—PLOT OF LOPEZ—CONCEALMENTS—HOOKER'S ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.

WHILE Jesuitic treachery was daily menacing the government, and keeping Elizabeth in constant apprehension for her life, no sense of common danger ever slackened Puritan energies for a single moment. A new conspiracy detected, was only fresh proof that Popery and rebellion were inseparables[1]. The ministry was lukewarm and infatuated, or it would have crushed, long since, a party that insulted heaven, and undermined society[2]. The

---

[1] "For into how many thousand townes of this land may the Jesuite come, as to an undefenced citie, and there take his pray at his pleasure! How easily with a word or two of his mouth reduce us simple people into Poperie, and consequently into rebellion!"—*The Lamentable Complaint of the Communaltie, by way of Supplication to the High Court of Parliament.* 1588.

[2] "O, that she had bene so happy to keepe out the ministers of antichrist once expulsed, as at first to expulse them, and put them out of her kingdome! But what by yeelding to intreatie of some about her by this generation foully abused, and what by

ultra Protestants themselves disclaimed all tenderness for their antipodes. They took the Mosaic law as a pattern for jurisprudence, obligatory upon Christians, and bringing Romanists under its lash, pronounced individuals inexcusable in suffering them to be treated otherwise than as capital offenders[1]. Protestant opposition provoked a corresponding violence. The Disciplinarians, or Consistorian Faction, as they were often called, had wrought themselves up into a persuasion that *Presbytery must prevail.* To stay its progress was fighting against God, a rash, hood-winked entrance upon incalculable perils[2]. Thus the ruling party, not only watched for its own defence, but also to keep from mutual destruction the two extremes. This was really a proud attitude of defensive moderation, as posterity would have long ago allowed, had it not been taken in a harsh and tyrannical age. Its austere, imperious front affords a 'vantage-

---

tolerating of such as were sent in by forreine enemies to practise against her life and kingdome, and what drawne backe by those that entertained intelligence with publicke enemies, she was perswaded to slacke execution of lawes, if not to suspend them, to her owne great trouble, and to the hazard of Religion and the State, but that God by his providence supplied the defects of men." (*Full and Round Answer*, preface.) "If any danger hanged over our heads, the same might easily be avoyded, if lawes had bene executed against traitors."—*Ibid.* 95.

[1] "If the magistrates refuse to put mass-mongers and false preachers to death, the people, in seeing it performed, do shew that zeal of God, which was commended in Phinees, destroying the adulterers, and in the Israelites against the Benjamites." (Citation from Goodman *apud* Bancroft. *Dangerous Positions.* 35.) "All men, counsellors, noblemen, inferior magistrates, and people are bound, and charged to see the lawes of God kept, and to suppresse and resist idolatrie by force."—*Idem. apud* Sutcliffe. *An Answere to certaine calumnious petitions, articles, and questions of the Consistorian Faction.* 70.

[2] "Presbyterie must prevaile: and if it come to passe, saith he to the bishops, in the preface to the *Demonstration of Discipline*, by that means which will make your harts to ake; blame yourselves."—Bancroft. *Sermon at Paule's Crosse.* 83.

ground to advocates of the two *ultras*. Those who plead for either, make no great mention of the other, but elaborately dwell upon hardships undergone by holders of their own, or similar opinions. Hence a policy, essentially the creature of external force, often passes for a wanton, cruel, headlong, persecution. It is not seen as a wise resistance to two exterminating extremes, because each of them treats it much as if neither the other, nor any moderate party existed. Elizabeth, however, found such a party from the first, and her preference for it has been nobly vindicated by experience. The Romish extreme has, indeed, survived with features very little changed, and has even lately been nursed by politics into a hectic appearance of renovated vigour. The consistorian platform, which aspirants after pastorships and ruling elderships insisted *must prevail*, at any cost, has long been universally exploded, as intolerant and impracticable[1]. It stood, however, long enough to ripen seed abundantly, and from this has arisen a proportionate crop. But the plants are neither uniform, nor harmoniously blended, nor secure of propagating their own individuality. The Church, however, which kept both *ultras* at bay, being deeply founded on a broad basis of learning and moderation, retains, with increasing popularity, her honourable position, wisely taken at a safe distance from either of them.

---

[1] Edwin Sandys, who died archbishop of York, after previously filling in succession the sees of Worcester and London, July 10, 1588, at the age of sixty-nine, thus expressed himself in his will. "Howbeit, as I do easily acknowledge our ecclesiastical polity in some points may be bettered, so do I utterly dislike even in my conscience, all such rude and indigested platforms, as have been more lately and boldly, than either learnedly or wisely preferred: tending not to the reformation, but to the destruction of this church of England: the particularities of both sorts reserved to the consideration of the godly wise. Of the latter I only say thus; that the state of a small private church, and the form of a larger Christian kingdom, neither would long like, nor can at all brook one and the same ecclesiastical government." (STRYPE. *Whitgift.* i. 548.) Archbishop Sandys had been represented as a favourer at bottom of Puritanical principles, and he did not live without a leaning that way. But his good sense easily saw that England and Geneva were not susceptible of the same experiments as to church-discipline.

This is largely owing to the queen's good sense and firmness. The ministry had come into power on the ruins of Romish ascendancy, and continued abundantly alive to danger from that quarter. It was, however, but little ready forany spirited resistance to the Low-Church extreme. Leicester, indeed, so long Elizabeth's personal favourite, belonged avowedly and actively to the Puritanical party[1]. Whether he really felt an interest in its religious principles is doubtful. But it never wanted his influence. Walsingham, Knollys, and Mildmay were very much of Puritans[2]. Burghley's opposition seldom savoured of any great antipathy to their opinions. It would be uncharitable to suppose that conviction did not operate, more or less, in all these cases; but undoubtedly, the monastic pillage, that made so many splendid fortunes, under Henry VIII., gave Presbytery a strong hold upon his daughter's cabinet. Its members were anxious to rise above official dependance, and to found wealthy families. Could the secular clergy be sacrificed, as the regulars had been, within half a century, a statesman might immediately defy pecuniary difficulty, and let imagination revel in the lofty halls of children's children. It is, however, an advantage in monarchical institutions, that a sovereign is placed above some of the motives that must act at every council-board. Elizabeth had imbibed religious information from the wary and learned Parker. Reflection confirmed her confidence in its general soundness, and personal motives to weaken its hold, could scarcely reach her. She knew the Church to be re-modelled upon the impregnable ground of Catholicity, and nothing could shake her determination to maintain it.

---

[1] Leicester died of a fever, on his way to Kenilworth, at Cornbury, in Oxfordshire, September 4, 1588. He was buried at Warwick. Dying a crown-debtor, the effects that he left were disposed of by public sale; rather an extraordinary sequel to so many years of royal favour. But judicious economy was among Elizabeth's good qualities, and nothing seemed to overcome her value for it.—CAMBDEN. 550. STOWE. 750.

[2] "We find that not only in the parliaments of Elizabeth, but also in her cabinet, at least for the first thirty years of her reign, there existed a very strong bias in favour of the Puritan party. Not only such persons as Knolles and Mildmay, and others who were Calvinists and Low-Churchmen on principle; nor again, such as Leicester, who may be suspected of looking chiefly to the spoils which any great church movement might place at his disposal; but even Burghley and Walsingham, it is well known, were continually finding themselves at issue with the archbishop of the day, concerning the degree of encouragement due to the Reformers. So that as far as the government was concerned, nothing but the firmness of the Queen herself, supporting first Parker, and afterwards Whitgift, prevented the adoption of the new model, at least in those parts of it which did not apparently and palpably intrude on royal authority."—KEBLE'S *Hooker*. Pref. lvii. Oxf. 1836.

She offered, accordingly the see of Canterbury to Whitgift, when the venerable Grindal, now blind and out of spirits, wanted to resign it[1]. His primacy had proved unhappy to himself, and probably, an exasperation to the prevailing religious discontent. The Puritans naturally regarded him as a martyr to their cause, and could not fail of blaming the queen for his disgrace. This was, in fact, universally regretted, for however men might disapprove the kind and conscientious archbishop's facility, all did homage to his unblemished morals, and winning sweetness of disposition. When death released him from the troubles and mortifications that clouded his latter years, John Whitgift no longer hesitated to remove from Worcester, and undertake the chief direction of ecclesiastical affairs[1]. The new archbishop was just young enough to escape the Protestant emigration, under Mary. He had imbibed reformed convictions, and was on the point of withdrawing to the continent. But Dr. Perne, master of Peter-house, of which he was fellow, probably thought a person, so inconspicuous from youth, likely to be overlooked, if he would only stoop to say little of his opinions[2]. He advised him, therefore, to stay, and Whitgift heard obediently. Thus he passed his time until

---

[1] Archbishop Grindal, having lost his sight some time before, towards the end of 1582, became quite hopeless of recovering it. He had expressed himself willing to resign, when contending for the *prophesyings*, in 1578, and the queen finding him incurably blind, in January, 1583, sent to say that his resignation would be accepted. His sequestration appears to have been removed a year or more previously, but the exact date is not known. The queen wished him to resign by Lady Day, but Whitgift refused the see, during his life. He only lived until the following July, his age being sixty-three. He was buried at Croydon.—STRYPE. *Grindal*. 411. 332. 403. 425. 431.

---

[1] Confirmed at Lambeth, September 23, 1583. His grandfather, also named John, was a Yorkshire gentleman, his father, named Henry, was a merchant, at Great Grimsby, in Lincolnshire. John, the future archbishop, eldest of six sons, was born either in 1530, or 1533. He received his school education chiefly at St. Antholin's school, in London, then in high repute. About 1548, he was entered of Queen's College, but he soon removed to Pembroke Hall, where Ridley was then master, and Grindal and Bradford were fellows. The latter, like the master, eventually a martyr, was Whitgift's tutor. That young man was elected fellow of Peter-house, in 1555. He took his doctor's degree, in 1567, was chosen master of Pembroke hall, in the same year, but resigned in three months for the mastership of Trinity college. He filled successively the Margaret and Regius professorships of divinity in his university.—STRYPE.

[2] "The Doctor willed him to be silent, and not troublesome in uttering his opinion, whereby others might take occasion to call him in question: and he, for his part, would wink at him, and so order the matter, that he might continue his religion, and not travel out of the university."—PAULE'S *Whitgift*. 6.

Elizabeth's accession, without any of that intercourse with unepiscopal foreigners, that made such a striking impression upon many who shared his belief, but had lived a few more years. He entered upon a new reign with all that Catholic regard for antiquity which had guided his country's reformers, while he was a boy, in discarding Romish innovations. Until Elizabeth had been on the throne two years, he had not even taken orders[1]. His professional character was established in the controversy with Cartwright. But polemics neither narrowed his mind, nor soured a temper naturally irritable[2]. His long prominence in repelling assailants of established institutions, earnt, indeed, for him considerable obloquy, from contemporaries, and posterity has rather aggravated it. He did, however, no more than keep men to the obligations under which they held preferment, no more than maintain the principles of Cranmer and Parker. Sometimes, he might have acted harshly, according to the unhappy fashion of his age. But his general habit is open to no such imputation: as Cartwright himself experienced and acknowledged[3]. Upon the whole, few men have risen more fairly to the top of a profession, or have conducted themselves, under a long course of embarrassing difficulties, with greater kindness and general propriety[1].

---

[1] 1560.—PAULE'S *Whitgift*. 6.

[2] "You see now of what an excellent nature this Archbishop was, how far from giving offence, how ready to forgive a wrong, merciful, compassionate, and tender-hearted. Yet was he not void (as no man is) of infirmities. The holy Scripture noteth of Elias, that he *was a man subject to the like passions as we are.* But as Horace saith,

—— optimus ille
Qui minimis urgetur.

So may it be confessed of this archbishop, that the greatest, or rather, the only fault known, in him was choler: and yet in him so corrected, not by philosophy alone, as Socrates confessed of his faults, but by the word and grace of God, as it rather served for a whetstone of his courage in just causes, rather than any weapon whetted against the person, goods, or good name of any other."—*Ibid.* 108.

[3] Cartwright having experienced from the archbishop, towards the close of life, both favourable interference, and connivance, acknowledged his "bond of most humble duty so much the straiter, because

The abuse levelled at him, and his brethren of the episcopal bench, must have been found occasionally rather a severe trial of temper. As Puritanism extended, and exasperation daily grew among its clerical adherents, from disappointed hopes, or the hardships that evaded engagements brought upon them, it found advocates who set all gravity and decency at utter defiance. During the very time when Philip's armament most awakened national anxiety, Puritanism built upon intimidation, and an ambulatory press was pouring, from various corners, a torrent of scurrilous libels against the hierarchy[2]. These

---

his Grace's favour proceeded from a frank disposition, without any desert of his own." — PAULE'S *Whitgift*. 71.

[1] "It is seldom good policy to confer such eminent stations in the Church on the gladiators of theological controversy; who, from vanity and resentment, as well as the course of their studies, will always be prone to exaggerate the importance of the disputes wherein they have been engaged, and to turn whatever authority the laws, or the influence of their place may give them, against their adversaries. This was fully illustrated by the conduct of Archbishop Whitgift, whose elevation the wisest of Elizabeth's counsellors had ample reason to regret." (HALLAM. *Const. Hist*. i. 269.) It might, however, seem "good policy" as well as justice, to "confer eminent" professional "stations" upon men of eminence in such professions. Whitgift had shewn himself such a man in various ways. Such men are usually above "vanity and resentment," and are little liable to be warped by "the course of their studies." Whitgift shewed himself superior to all these weaknesses. No doubt, his "elevation" might be regretted by any "counsellors" who were Puritanically-disposed, or eager to carve out fortunes from the church, but it was an accomplished theologian's honourable reward; it was a barrier against ruling elderships, which struck at the root of civil and religious liberty; it was conservative of a religious policy, that steered at an equal distance from two irreconcilable extremes, and secured for a sober-minded nation an established church which daily gains upon its deliberate conviction.

[2] "And *Martin senior professeth* that when the enemie was readie to assayle us abroad, there

indecent pasquinades appeared under different titles, but chiefly passed as the productions of *Martin Mar-Prelate*[1]. Exactly whom this ludicrous appellation masked was never known: but the person most entitled to it appears to have been a young Welshman, named Penry, soon after betrayed by his own violence, and the arbitrary principles of his time, to an untimely end. He was, however, most probably nothing more than a principal author of these offensive publications. *Mar-Prelate* seems to have been a scurrilous buffoon with several heads.

---

were a hundred thousand handes readie to subscribe the supplication of Puritanes at home: which, saith he, *in good pollicie (we being in feare of outward force) might not bee denied, nor discouraged.*"—SUTCLIFFE. *An Answere to certain calumnious petitions.* 54.

[1] "In the year 1588, came forth those hateful libels of *Martin Mar-Prelate*, and much about the same time, the *Epitome*, the *Demonstration of Discipline*, the *Supplication*, *Diotrophes*, the *Minerals*, *Have you any work for a Cooper*, *Martin Junior*, alias *Theses Martinianæ*, *Martin Senior*, *More work for the Cooper*, and other such like bastardly pamphlets, which might well be *nullius filii*, because no man durst father their births. All which were printed with a kind of wandering press, which was first set-up at Moulsey, near Kingston upon Thames, and from thence conveyed to Fausley, in Northamptonshire, and from thence to Norton, afterwards to Coventry, and from thence to Welston, in Warwickshire, from which place the letters were sent to another press in or near Manchester, where (by means of Henry, that good Earl of Derby) the press was discovered in printing of *More work for a Cooper*. Which shameful libels were fraughted only with odious and scurrilous calumniations against the established government, and such reverend prelates as deserved honour with uprighter judgements. Some of the printers, whilst they were busied about the last libel, were apprehended; who, with the entertainers and receivers of the press were proceeded-against in the Star-Chamber, and there censured; but upon their submission (at the humble suit of the Archbishop) were both delivered out of prison, and eased of their fines." (PAULE'S *Whitgift*. 52.) At Fausley, were seated the Knightleys, an opulent Puritanical family. Archbishop Whitgift was directed by an order of council, November 14, 1588, to search for the authors, printers, and dispersers of these libels, with their accomplices. (STRYPE. *Whitgift*. i. 552.) On the 13th of February, 1589, a proclamation was issued against the obnoxious publications.—*Ibid.* Append. XLI. iii. 216.

His antics were not merely playful. Nothing could be more venomous, or savour more suspiciously of personal rancour, than many of his calls upon public attention. Prelacy, with him, was a personification of falsehood and roguery, which legalised all arts likely to render it hateful and ridiculous[1]. Cartwright, with others of his party, promptly expressed a disapproval of such polemics, and later dissenters have been unanimous in condemning them[2]. Virulence, and low buffoonery will, in fact, never serve any party long, and a religious body cannot use them at all, without experiencing an immediate recoil. But talent will enable them to answer a temporary purpose. Jesting gains a ready entrance where argument would knock in vain, and a person, or order, that has made us laugh, easily slides into something that we ought to execrate. But *Mar-Prelate* commonly disdained the circuitous road of ill-natured pleasantry. He went at once to the coarsest invectives, and foulest imputations. Thus, those who could endure him at all, were supplied with stimulants to work upon the worst and weakest parts of human nature. Seasoning so palatable to man, though so poisonous, while fresh and abundant, could not fail of tainting extensively the public mind. It was equally sure of outraging those whom it sought to insult, pillage, and degrade. The *Mar-Prelate* tracts, therefore, although substantially contemptible, had an obvious tendency to widen the breach that had long threatened society, and to gall the wounds which were seemingly gaining upon its vitals.

---

[1] "Our L. BB. as Ihon of Canterbury, with the rest of that swinish rabble, are petty Antichrists, petty popes, proud prelates, enemies to the Gospel, and most covetous wretched-priests.—I suppose them to be in the state of the sin against the Holy Ghost.—Right puissant and terrible priests, my clergy, masters of our Confocation house, whether fickers, worshipful paltripolitans, or others of the holy league of subscription; right poisoned, persecuting and terrible priests; worshipful priests of the crew of monstrous and ungodly wretches, that to maintain their own outrageous proceedings, mingle heaven and earth together. All who have subscribed, have approved lies upon the Holy Ghost.—Our BB. and proud, popish, presumptuous, paltry, pestilent, and pernicious prelates, are usurpers. I will presently *mar* the fashion of your Lordships. They are cogging and cozening knaves. The bishops will lie like dogs, Impudent, shameless, wainscot-faced BB.—I have heard some say, his Grace will speak against his conscience. It is true."—Extracts from the *Mar-Prelate Tracts.* STRYPE. *Whitgift.* i. 553. 570. 571.

[2] "I am hable to make good proof, that from the first beginning of Martin unto this day, I have continually, upon any occasion, testified both my mislike and sorrow for such kind of disordered proceeding." (Cartwright to Burghley, October 4, 1590. STRYPE. *Whitgift.* Append. I. iii. 232.) "The more discreet and devout sort of men, even of such as were no great friends to the hierarchy, upon solemn debate, then resolved (I speak on certain knowledge from the mouths of such whom I must believe) that for many foul falsehoods therein suggested, such books were altogether unbeseeming a pious spirit, to print, publish, or with pleasure peruse, which supposed true both in matter and measure, charity would rather conceal than discover. The best of men being so conscious of their own badness, that they are more careful to wash their own faces, than busie to throwe dirt on others. Any man may be witty in a biting way, and those that have the dullest brains, have commonly the sharpest teeth for that purpose. But such carnal mirth, whilst it tickles the flesh, doth wound the soul." (FULLER. 193.)

Another evil of these wretched effusions, was a call for similar ribaldry, certain to be heard by the other side.

"It is sad, when a controversy about serious matters runs these dregs. Ridicule and personal reflection may expose an adversary and make him ashamed, but will never convince, or reconcile: it carries a contempt which sticks in the heart, and is hardly ever to be removed; nor do I remember any cause that has been served by such methods." (NEAL. i. 442.) "They were written in a coarse and abusive style, abounded in reproaches and calumny; and were as unworthy of the cause they advocated, as their spirit was foreign from the meekness of Christianity. They infinitely surpassed the ordinary limits of controversial invective and bitterness, and attached an odium to Puritanism, which the virtues of many of its disciples were unable to obliterate. The ruffled temper and angry passions of men infuriated by oppression, were much more conspicuous in their composition than the zeal which was professed for the honour and extension of religion."—PRICE. i. 369.

Many of the libelled churchmen thought no way so likely to remove the jest from themselves, as to turn the Puritans out for derision. Several pieces, accordingly, were published, which fought Martin with his own unworthy banter[1]. The graver spirits could neither stoop to this, nor descry any lasting advantage from it. Hence Thomas Cowper, bishop of Winchester, printed *An Admonition to the People of England*, in which he both exposed Martin's libels, and refuted many current charges which brought obloquy upon the hierarchy, and the whole clerical body. In composing this treatise, he had assistance from Archbishop Whitgift, and others of the prelacy[2]. As might be expected, his assault was a signal for new activity among the *Mar-Prelate* family: but a serious exposure can never be wholly recovered by dealers in unscrupulous satire. Nor on the other hand, will anything efface an injurious impression once made on careless minds, by writers who press mirth into the service of spite.

---

[1] "There was not only one *Martin Mar-Prelate*, but other venomous books daily printed and dispersed: books that were so absurd and scurrilous, that the graver divines disdained them an answer. And yet these were grown into high esteem with the common people, till Tom Nash appeared against them all, who was a man of a sharp wit, and the master of a scoffing, satirical, merry pen, which he employed to discover the absurdities of those blind, malicious, senseless pamphlets, and sermons as senseless as they: Nash's answers being like his books which bore these, or like titles, *An Almond for a Parrot; A Fig for my Godson; Come crack me this Nut*, and the like: so that his merry wit made some sport, and such a discovery of their absurdities as (which is strange) he put a greater stop to these malicious pamphlets than a much wiser man had been able."—WALTON'S *Life of Hooker*. 153.

[2] STRYPE. *Whitgift*. i. 575. This piece occasioned *More Work for a Cooper*, and the like, which treated the author as "a flattering hypocrite, an impudent, shameless, and wainscot-faced bishop; a monstrous hypocrite." Dr. John Bridges, dean of Salisbury, also wrote against the *Mar-Prelate* libels. In the title-page of an answer to him, is "Oh! read over Dr. John Bridges; for it is a worthy work. Printed over sea in Europe, within two furlongs of a bouncing priest, at the cost and charges of Martin Mar-Prelate, Gent."—NEAL. i. 441.

A new parliament had been summoned soon after Philip's expedition failed, but it did not meet for the despatch of business until early in the following year[1]. As usual, the House of Commons, though warned from the queen, on assembling, against ecclesiastical interference, discovered a strong infusion of Puritanism Mr. Davenport made complaints of existing laws ill-observed, and maintained that a religious policy more strictly legal would suffice for the general satisfaction[2]. As no ingenuity in the construction of favourite statutes was very likely to accomplish any such result, a bill was brought in for the abolition of pluralities[3]. This, after a time, was abandoned, and another of the same kind took its place[4], which passed with some difficulty[5]. Of its fate in the Upper House nothing farther is known, than that it duly made its way thither[6]. The Convocation was alarmed by its progress through the Commons, and earnestly remonstrated against the impolicy of such a measure, and the hardships which it must bring upon the clergy[1]. Enemies of that body, and superficial observers, always hear of such remonstrances with a sneer. Nor, probably, was there ever a time which would not supply cases of abuse as to pluralities, and all other worldly advantages. But, in most instances, a second benefice will hardly place the holder upon a pecuniary level with other professional men, or with persons generally in the middle stations. Ecclesiastical preferments are usually of very small amount, and are always burdened in a manner of which scarcely any but clerical incumbents are aware. The strict confinement of clergymen to a single living, under present circumstances, has, therefore, an obvious tendency to degrade their profession, and to keep men of ability from entering it. To render such a restriction equitable and expedient, small contiguous parishes must be laid together. But this would merely shift pluralities from one form to another. In many cases, the alteration would be found no improvement. An incumbent would serve, personally, two contiguous parishes, who now supplies one at a distance by means of a curate. Thus a population has the benefit of two ministers, which pays, probably, but insufficiently for one. As for that one of the two who has only a portion of the benefice, on which he resides, he is commonly a junior member of his profession. He may fairly wait some time for an establishment, as persons of his age do in every other walk of life. The real difficulty, under existing parochial subdivisions, is to plant a minister of religion in every parish, with such outward appliances as most other men well brought-up gradually acquire. Every man, with an average of industry, steadiness, talent, and morals, naturally looks for such equality after a reasonable interval. But besides justice to the parties themselves, clerical establishments are also very great local advantages. Their absolute coincidence with parishes is, however, precluded by the Church's poverty. Many of her benefices are too poor to command a well-qualified minister with means for maintaining a respectable household; and it may be added, many of her parishes are so small, as to render only the former of these two benefits pressingly important.

---

[1] Feb. 4. The Houses were originally summoned for Nov. 12, 1588.—D'Ewes. 419.

[2] Feb. 25. The particulars that he had in view, were given in writing to the speaker, but not read to the House; in consequence, probably, of Mr. Secretary Woolley's reference to the queen's inhibition, at the opening of the session. The speaker, George Snagg, sergeant-at-law, delivered Davenport's paper to him again, March 17, before he went to the House.—*Ibid.* 438, 439.

[3] By Mr. Apsley, Feb. 27.—*Ibid.* 440.

[4] March 5. Brought in by Mr. Treasurer Knollys, of the Puritan party, member of a committee appointed for the former bill, March 1. The new bill was unanimously approved by the committee, who, besides Knollys, were Morice, Beal, Sir Robert Jermin, and Sir Francis Hastings, all friends to the Puritans.—D'Ewes. 442. Strype. *Whitgift.* i. 533.

[5] Strype. *ut supra.*

[6] March 10.—D'Ewes. 444.

---

[1] Neal has printed most of this address, and Mr. Price has followed his example, but both omit this rational counsel, "Requests without grounded reasons are lightly to be rejected." Both, however, print the sycophantic pedantry of applying to Elizabeth Virgil's *O! Dea certe.* Neal merely introduces this by saying of the clergy, "having flattered her with the title of a *goddess.*" Mr. Price allows his readers to see how the Convocation used it. After highly complimenting the queen's government, especially as to religion, the address proceeds:—"Senseless are they that repine at it, and careless which lightly regard it. The respect hereof made the prophet say, *Dii estis:* all the faithful and discreet clergy say, *O! Dea certe.*" It may not be possible to ascertain "the prophet" cited here, but David seems likely, who says, (Psalm LXXXII. 6,) "I have said, *Ye are gods*, and all of you are children of the Most High." Now, this whole Psalm appears to concern magistrates, an order to which Elizabeth belonged. They are, however, naturally spoken of in the masculine gender, which was not suitable to the queen. Some pedant might remember the Æneid, under this difficulty, and introduce a passage in miserable taste, undoubtedly, and in an unworthy spirit, but hardly calling for the castigation which it receives from Mr. Price: "When the ministers of religion disgrace themselves, and insult their prince, by the employment of such language, they expose their motives to suspicion, and bring their profession into contempt."—*Hist. Nonconf.* i. 380. *Hist. Pur.* i. 436. STRYPE. *Whitgift.* i. 535.

As many members came to parliament strikingly ignorant upon religious and ecclesiastical questions, a remarkable sermon was delivered at St. Paul's Cross, apparently to lighten that very evil, on the Sunday next after the Houses met[1]. The preacher was Dr. Richard

---

[1] Feb. 9. Strype very reasonably conjectures that the archbishop might have set his chaplain upon this service.

Bancroft, then chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and eventually himself occupant of the metropolitical chair. His great aim was to found episcopacy upon Scripture, in which, he maintained, its principles were substantially, though not expressly recorded. Presbytery, he treated as a selfish contrivance, incapable of establishing any connection with antiquity, and indebted for support either to interest or passion. He painted its absurd, intolerant claims to the most venerable analogies, its tendency to captivate laymen with hopes of pillage, clergymen with hopes of income, and to puff up youth with an unseemly, ridiculous conceit[1]. In these, and

---

[1] "There are verie manie now-a-daies, who do affirm that when Christ used the words *Dic Ecclesiæ*, he meant thereby to establish in the Church for ever the same plat and forme of ecclesiastical government to be erected in everie parish, which Moses, by Jethroes counsell, appointed in Mount Sinaie; and which the Jewes did imitate in their particular synagogs. They had (saie these men) in their synagogs their priests, we must have in every parish our pastors: they their levites, we our doctors: they their rulers of their synagogs, we our elders: they their leviticall treasurers, we our deacons. This forme of government they call the tabernacle which God hath appointed, the glorie of God, and of his Sonne, Jesus Christ, the presence of God, the place which he hath chosen to put his name there, the court of the Lord, and the shining foorth of God's glorie. Where this ecclesiasticall synode is not erected, they say God's ordinance is not performed, the office of Christ, as he is a king, is not acknowledged; in effect, that without this government, we can never attaine to a right and true feeling of Christian religion, but are to be reckoned among those who are accounted to saie of Christ, as it is in Luke, *We will not have this man to raigne over us.* And their conclusion upon this point against all who do withstand their government is this, according as it likewise followeth in the same place, *Those mine enemies which would not that I should raigne over them, bring hither, and slay them before me.*" (BANCROFT'S *Sermon at Paule's Crosse.* Lond. 1588. p. 9.)

"I am fully of this opinion, that the hope which manie men have conceived of the spoile of bishops' livings, of the subversion of cathedrall churches, and of a havocke to be made of all the churches revenues, is the chiefest and most principall cause of the greatest schismes that we have at this day in our Church." (*Ibid.* 24.)

"I have thought good to devide

other respects, the sermon is an historical document of considerable value. Its most important use, was the

the factions of our age into two sorts: the clergie factions, and the laie factions. The clergie factions do contend that all the livings that now appertain to the Church ought of right to be emploied for the maintenance of their presbyteries, and that rather than they should want, the old spoile of the abbeys, and such religious houses, should be restored again unto their use; and in this course they are so earnest, that, in a supplication, exhibited in the name of the communaltie to the high court of Parleament, 1585, they have set down as a resolute doctrin, that things once dedicated to a sacred use, ought so to remain by the word of God for ever, and ought not to be converted to anie private use. The laic factions, on the other side, are of a far contrarie opinion: for, saie they, (as it appeareth in the late *Admonition to the People of England*, as I conceive by the circumstances there noted,) our preachers ought to conforme themselves to the example of Christ and his apostles. Their Master had not a house to put his head in. The apostles, their predecessors, had neither gold nor silver, possessions, riches, goods, nor revenues: and why, then, should they, being in gifts and pains inferior to them, have greater preferments in the world than they had? If they have a messe of pottage, and a canvas doublet, may it not content them? Surelie, these advancements which they have, do greatlie hinder and hurt them." (*Ibid.* 25.)

"Whilest they" (the gentry) "heare us speake against Bb. and cathedrall churches, (saith the author of the *Ecclesiasticall Discipline*,) it tickleth their eares, looking for the like praie they had before of monasteries: yea, they have, in their harts, devoured alreadie the Churches inheritance. They care not for religion, so they may get the spoile. They could be content to crucify Christ, so they might have his garments. Our age is full of spoiling soldiers, and of wicked Dionysius, who will rob Christ of his golden coate, as neither fit for him in winter nor sommer. They are cormorants, and seeke to fill the bottomlesse sacke of their gredie appetites. They do yawne after a pray, and would thereby, to their perpetuall shame, purchase to themselves a field of blood. And whereas you have alreadie in your hands many impropriations and other church livings, they say that, in keeping them, you sinne against your owne consciences: that you ought to be so far from looking for any more, which doth now appertaine to the Church, as that you ought rather to feare you lose not what you have alreadie: especially seeing you waste the same in courtly braverie, and consume it with most sacrilegious impudency and boldness. I have not used a word of mine own herein, but have been a faithfull relator to you, what the clergie factions do thinke of their laic schollers." (*Ibid.* 28.)

"Marie, now two or three

direction of public opinion to that form of religious polity which had ever been established in England, but which was placed, by various necessities, in the beginning of this reign, under some degree of seeming uncertainty. Bancroft laid it broadly down that episcopal government is a divine ordinance, and men might calmly consider, whether either learned inquiry, or national institutions, would sanction departure from it. The Puritans were violently offended, and Sir Francis Knollys made an attempt to awaken the jealousy of Elizabeth, by representing Bancroft's doctrine as an infringement of the royal supremacy[1]. But his mistress knew better. Nor

---

yeeres studie is as good as twentie. It is woonderfull to see how some men get perfection. One of fower or five-and-twenty yeeres' old, if you anger him, will swear he knoweth more than all the ancient fathers. And yet in verie deed, they are so earnest and fierce, that either we must believe them, or else account their boldness to be, as it is, most untollerable."—*Ibid.* 58.

[1] STRYPE. *Whitgift.* i. 559. In August, 1590, Knollys was harping again upon this string, in a letter to Burghley. He said, that he "sought not his own ambition, nor his covetousness, as the bishops are accused to do, but her majesty's safety; which cannot otherwise be continued, but by the maintenance of her supreme government against the false-claimed superiority of bishops from God's own institution. For the pride of the bishops' claim must be pulled down, and made subject to her majesty's supreme government. And they must confess that they have no superiority of government at all, but by commission from her majesty: for otherwise their claimed superiority is treasonable to her, and tyrannous over the inferior clergy." (*Ibid.* ii. 52.) Probably, this very loyal effusion should be interpreted, as protestations often ought to be, by the rule of contraries. Many sturdy disclaimers of "ambition and covetousness," have unwittingly stumbled upon the very things uppermost in their minds. Knollys might have imbibed some theological opinions really adverse to episcopacy, but a man not ennobled, of great influence, and small fortune, could hardly fail at that time, even without knowing it, to find strong confirmation for unepiscopal convictions, in the convenient estates and envied precedence of bishops. The ridiculous pretences of loyalty, by which "this great patriot of that party," as Strype calls him, sought to enlist Elizabeth on his side, were wholly wasted upon her. So early as May, 1590, she expressed herself displeased with

did the spirited and learned preacher fail of making a salutary impression upon the public. Unquestionably he was instrumental in correcting those loose notions of ecclesiastical government, which would have rent from the Church of England one of the most venerable and beneficial evidences of Catholicity[1].

Attempts to undermine this connecting link with apostolic times, were daily made under all the advantages of regular organization. Distant observers may suppose that a few polemics and their admirers were making a din for Presbytery, which neglect would soon have reduced to silence. But in fact, a systematic association had been zealously at work, during seven years at least[2].

---

his Puritanical spirit of meddling. Nor was this the first reprimand of the kind that she gave to the zealous treasurer of her household. He had received a similar discouragement some years ago; which, probably, was the reason why he now covered his antipathies with such a thick coating of loyal varnish.

[1] Heylin considers Bancroft's sermon to have had a great immediate operation. He says, it "wrought so much upon his auditors of both Houses of Parliament, that in the passing of a general pardon at the end of the sessions, there was an exception of *Seditious Books, Disturbances of Divine Service, and Offences against the Act of Uniformity in the Worship of God.*" (*Hist. Presb.* 284.) Neal says of Bancroft's reference of episcopacy to divine institution, that "it was new doctrine at this time." (*Hist. Pur.* i. 434.) Sir Francis Knollys might have taught him otherwise, mentioning it as "set down in a printed book, entitled *Dr. Whitgift against Cartwright.*" (STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 51.) Mr. Price also says, "such a claim constituted a new ground of debate;" and he thus winds up: "There is scarcely a dogma in the creed of any religionist which is held in more derision and contempt than that for which Bancroft pleaded." (*Hist. Noncons.* i. 377.) Both historians, however, are at issue with Knollys, as to *novelty*, even under Elizabeth. The talk of "derision and contempt," reminds one of Esop and the sour grapes.

[2] "There was an assembly of three score ministers appointed out of Essex, Cambridgeshire, and Norfolk, to meet on the 8th of May, 1582, at Cockefield, (Master Knewstubs towne,) there to conferre of the common booke, what might be tollerated, and what necessarily to be refused in every point of it: apparel, matter, form, dayes, fastings, injunctions, *&c.*

When first formed, it had no code of principles but such as had been evolved by Cartwright, in his controversy with Whitgift. But Travers afterwards appeared with his famous *Book of Discipline*,—a piece far better concocted, and more eloquently written. This became, henceforth, the *Palladium* of Presbytery[1]. Nor were

Of this meeting it is thus reported,—*Our meeting was appointed to be kept very secretly, and to be made knowne to none.*"—BANCROFT. *Dangerous Positions.* 44.

[1] "Hitherto, it should seeme, that in all their proceedings, they had relied chiefly upon the *First Admonition*, and Cartwright's booke, as having no particular and several platforme that was generally allowed-of among them for the Church of England. But now at length, about the year 1583, *The Forme of Discipline*, which is lately come to light, was compiled, and thereupon an assembly, or councell, being helde, as I thinke, at London, or at Cambridge, certaine decrees were made concerning the establishing and the practice thereof." (*Ibid.* 45.) The confederacy having thus gotten its principles into a more satisfactory form, began to rise in confidence and menace. Cholmely writes to Field from Antwerp, June 25, 1583, in Latin, which Bancroft thus translates:—"I am glad with all my heart for the better successe of your affairs, not only in that I heare of your assemblies, but most willingly of all, in respect of your effectual practising of the Ecclesiasticall Discipline. I will tell you that which is true, you have begun this course too late. Whosoever shall now, either refuse to begin, or shall desist from so notable an enterprise, he shall beare his own sinne. In nothing feare your adversaries, which is to them a token of perdition, but to you of salvation, and that from God." (*Ibid.* 75.) When the Disciplinarians thought of Scotland, they naturally felt additional courage, and a visit from some of the ministers who had so successfully bearded civil authority in that ill-governed country, made them speculate immediately upon similar ascendancy at home. "In 1584, some of the Scottish ministers before spoken of, went to the Act in Oxford, where Master Gelibrand, with his brethren, gave them great entertainment. At that time there was a notable question propounded amongst their favourers there, by the said ministers, as is manifest by these words: *There have been a good company of godly brethren, this Act, Master Fen, Wilcox, Axton: the Scottish ministers and we have had some meeting and conference, to our great comfort that are here. One point* (which was then moved) *I could wish to be thoroughly debated among you and them, concerning the proceeding of the minister in his dutie, without the assistance, or tarrying for the magistrate.* What was resolved amongst the brethren of

those who clamoured violently against subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles contented without a formal assent to this approved standard of Consistorian polity. To force it upon the country, no preparations were wanting that an unrecognised and illegal body could command. Congregations were secretly formed upon the Presbyterian scheme of elective aristocracy. These were affiliated into regular classes, and the latter, again, were under direction of a national assembly. So that the Disciplinarians were organized no less skilfully than the Jesuits, and they naturally felt all that confidence of ultimate success, which numbers, arrangement, and unity

---

London about this matter at that time, I know not. Marry, this I finde, that presently thereupon they grew more violent, and prepared themselves to procede more resolutely in the challenging of their Discipline, as it is plaine by the dealing both of them, and of their favourers, that yeare, in November and December after, at the Parliament, 27 of her Majestie." (*Ibid.* 74.) "Furthermore, at the time of the Parliament last mentioned, I finde that there was a *national Synod* held likewise in London by these brethren." (*Ibid.* 75.) The Discipline was reviewed in 1585, and sent abroad about 1587. (*Ibid.* 76.) In the same year, it was established in Northamptonshire, where three classes were formed, *viz.*, Northamptonshire, Daventry side, Kettering side. It obtained a footing in most parts of England, but especially in Warwickshire, Suffolk, Norfolk, and Essex. (*Ibid.* 77.) The Warwickshire *classis*, in 1588, came to various determinations against the liturgy and the hierarchy. (*Ibid.* 86.) A Disciplinarian meeting at Northampton threw a temporary damp over the system. When about to subscribe, "there was a general censuring used amongst the brethren there, as it were to sacrifice themselves, partly by sustaining a kind of penance and reproof for their former conformity to the orders of the Church established by her Majesty, and other matters of conversation; and partly to prepare their minds for the devout accepting of the foresaide booke. In which course of censuring used at that time, there was such ripping up of one another's life, even from their youth, as that they came unto great bitternesse, with many reviling termes amongst themselves, one growing thereby odious to another, and some did thereupon utterly forsake those kind of assemblies." (*Ibid.* 88.) Human beings can seldom dwell more safely upon moral nudity, than upon bodily.

of direction, will not unfairly warrant. Hence the disappointment of their expectations in the last parliament had no effect upon their hopes. Their organization was constantly advancing towards perfection, and their zeal had all the usual energy of those who have everything to gain, and nothing to lose. Cambridge had always been one of their most important strongholds, and there they held, this year, a well-attended synod, under cover of Stourbridge fair. They appear to have adjourned to Ipswich[1]. The results of both these important meetings were subsequently submitted to a national synod in London: which formally confirmed what had been done[2]. All these proceedings were not, it should be remembered, allowable combinations for obtaining liberty of conscience. They were essentially conspiracies to overthrow one of the most venerable and important in the national institutions. They sought the forcible, unrequited transfer of ecclesiastical patronage from those who had bought or inherited it,—the transfer of ecclesiastical discipline, but with new and inquisitorial appliances, to the paid favourites of a popular election. For the payment of these lucky candidates, they would have confiscated all the cathedral property, and seized, as now sacrilegiously alienated, all the monastic estates. They were utterly unfavourable to liberty of conscience among Protestants, and against Romanism they breathed a spirit of intolerance, far more sanguinary than any that had been hitherto adopted. They talked even of adding ferocity to the criminal code, by introducing capital felonies from the Mosaic law. Nor were all these projects poured forth at random, as is usual when men are merely giving vent to favourite ideas which they have no prospect of seeing realised. So confidently did the Disciplinarians rely upon the speedy attainment of their ambitious ends, that they had even thought of plans for pensioning the bishops and others, whose incomes were to be confiscated[1].

---

[1] "In 1589, there was another Synode, or generall meeting, held in St. John's College, in Cambridge, where, saith Mr. Barber, they did correct, alter, and amend divers imperfections contained in the booke, called, *Disciplina Ecclesiæ Sacra, Verbo Dei descripta*, and as Master Stone affirmeth, did not only perfect the said forme of Discipline, but also did then and there, as he remembereth, voluntarily agree amongst themselves, that so many as would, should subscribe to the said booke of Discipline after that time. The persons that met in this assembly were, as these two last deponents affirme, Master Cartwright, Master Snape, Master Allen, Master Gifford, Master Perkins, Master Stone, Master Barber, Master Harrison, with others. I finde mention also of another Synode, 1589, held, as I take it, at Ipswich." (BANCROFT. *Dangerous Positions.* 89.) Heylin says, without any reserve, that the latter synod was holden at Ipswich, and that the Cambridge synod was fixed for the time of Stourbridge fair, as a cloak. He says also of the subscription tendered at Cambridge, but professedly for free choice,—"Not long after, it was made a matter necessary, so necessary, as it seems that no man could be chosen to any ecclesiastical office amongst them, nor to be of any of their assemblies, either classical, provincial, or national, till he had first subscribed to the Book of Discipline." (*Hist. Presb.* 286.) This is reasonable, and, in fact, necessary, although inconsistent with the Disciplinarian clamour against subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. No society can exist without terms of conformity.

[2] HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 286. Bancroft says, as must obviously be true, that the most important meetings were those in London. Cartwright, Travers, and Egerton, were chosen, at different times, moderators, or presidents in them. —*Dangerous Positions.* 90.

Machinery for such ends, could not long work unnoticed by the wakeful government of Elizabeth. Nor can any administration regard a growing confederacy, illegally directed, without uneasiness. To check the growth of this, nothing appeared more politic and equitable, than the arrest of Cartwright, its original mover. After his earlier troubles, he had resided at Antwerp, as chaplain to the factory, displaying, during several years, all those valuable qualities, which really adorned his character. But health gave way, and he was advised to try his native air. On landing in England, John Aylmer, bishop of London, somewhat officiously, as it seems, though not without royal warrant, caused him to be placed in custody[1]. By Burghley's intervention, he soon regained his liberty, and Leicester preferred him to the mastership of an hospital at Warwick, lately founded by himself. Though no contemptible provision, the peer did not rest contented with it. His generous patronage added a pension of larger amount than a great majority of even the better parochial benefices[2]. Thus Cartwright reached advanced age, in far higher circumstances, than most men who enter upon the Church as a profession. Nor, as there was little or no disposition to interfere with his preaching, so long as it kept within its legitimate province of instruction, did his years pass either without great utility, or without the honest gratification of well-earnt applause. Probably, if left to himself, the elderly apostle of Puritanism would have quietly travelled on to eternity, in the thankful enjoyment of opulence, honour, and usefulness. But his position unhappily brought him under the constant notice of younger spirits, calculating upon credit, and easy circumstances, through the *Holy Discipline*. Men's pride commonly keeps them both from frankly avowing early haste, and from declining present distinction. Cartwright, accordingly, could be brought from Warwick, to figure as leading adviser, or even moderator, in self-called, self-erected national synods, clandestinely convened, and illegally holden under cover of various pretences. Yet their members were banded with a view to change the constitution, and interfere with property; they threatened an eleemosynary pension, or

---

[1] HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 287. This fact appeared from a letter of Lord to Fenn.—STRYPE. *Whitgift.* Append. III. iii. 240.

---

[1] STRYPE. *Aylmer.* 76. The letter, in which Bishop Aylmer complains of his misfortune in arresting Cartwright by the queen's command, and yet incurring her displeasure, by stating so, is undated. "But in the Lansdowne collection in the British Museum, are two letters from Cartwright to Burleigh, the one dated, April, 1585, requesting that nobleman to procure his liberty, and the other, June, 1585, returning thanks to his Lordship for having done so." —PRICE'S *Hist. Nonconf.* i. 357. note.

[2] His mastership was 50*l.* a year, and a house. Leicester gave him an annuity of 50*l.* a year, besides. (STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 122.) The King's Books will shew that few beneficed clergymen then had any such income. His opulence was evidently notorious. "Master Cartwright died rich, as it was said, by the benevolence and bounty of his followers." (PAULE. 72.) Sutcliffe, in all the bitterness of controversy, will not allow his wealth to have been fairly gained. "What hath T. Cartw. to meddle with the charge of his hospitall, a matter meere civill, and wherein he hath done more good, then in ecclesiasticall causes? For he hath bestirred himselfe so, that, what by rewardes, what by availes of his hospitall, and pinching those that are committed to his charge, and what by buying and selling, the man is growen fatte and rich. Of his ministry we see no fruit, but contention and trouble.—Tho. Cartwright, a man that hath more landes of his own in possession, then any bishop that I knowe, and that fareth dayntily every day, and feedeth fayre and fatte, and that lyeth as soft as any tenderling of that broode, and hath wonne much wealth in a short time, and will leave more to his posteritie then any bishop.—If he keepe himselfe private, and seeke not to advaunce himselfe by pillage of

the Church, I for my part will let him alone: neyther shall his frier-like begging, nor his covetous dealing with his hospitall, nor his disloyall dealing with his good friendes, nor his usurie, nor any other matters be touched, or carped at.—*Quære*, because he asketh me certaine questions of Th. Cartw. by what mysterie, or science, a man may sell a coate, and 3 or 4 acres of land, and purchase there-with 3 or 4 good lordships, and yet maintaine a great familie, and fare well, and keepe a pedant to teach his daughters Hebrewe." (*An Answere to certaine calumnious petitions, articles, and questions of the Consistorian faction.* 123. 155. 204.) It seems from p. 155 of this tract, that when opponents taxed the opulence of Cartwright, his friends accounted for it by the fortunate sale of some small estate, probably patrimonial. Sutcliffe says, "Hee is a most happy man, that, with selling a cottage, and so much ground as would scarse grase three goslings, worth, at the utmost, but twentie nobles yeerly, can purchase two or three hundred markes land: and gladly would I learne that secrete."

absolute destitution, to a large body of independent professional men; they must necessarily have often vented much reprehensible violence. Nay, the celebrated moderator himself is very precisely charged with repeated instances of an intemperance, disgraceful to any time of life, and rarely seen under the sedative operation of age[1].

He was brought into the consistory of St. Paul's, before John Aylmer, bishop of London, the two chief justices, and other law officers, for the purpose of answering under oath *ex officio*, thirty-one charges[2]. These accused him of renouncing his lawful calling to the diaconate, and undergoing some new sort of ordination abroad; of then conferring such ordination upon certain of the queen's subjects, some, like himself, previously ordained, others, not; of acting as president in an unlawful eldership that exercised ecclesiastical authority; of breaking the promise, faithfully made on his return from the continent, to abstain from attacks upon the Church of England; of setting at defiance the suspension of his diocesan, incurred by the frequency and offensiveness of such attacks; of nurturing an uncharitable spirit of faction; of concealing a knowledge of those who wrote the *Mar-Prelate*, and other libels, and of pronouncing such pieces allowable, after the failure of grave arguments; of writing, or procuring to be written, and overlooking and authorizing, the two authentic declarations of Discipline, received among his followers[1]; of organizing with others a national confederacy to carry this Discipline through the country; and of laying down various positions, reconcileable neither with religious, nor canonical usages, established by law[2]. It seems, that, before these articles were read, an oath was tendered to the prisoner, binding him generally to answer what should be objected to him. This he refused to take, although urgently assured by the lawyers, that such refusal was contrary to the laws of the realm. Even this he would not admit, adding that he thought himself, at all events, precluded by God's law from taking any such oath. Hence he pronounced it peculiarly unfit for a minister. Having, however, heard the articles objected to him, he thought some of them in their nature criminal, and from such, if allowed sufficient time and counsel, he offered to clear himself, as desired, although still of opinion, that the oath could not by any law be demanded. The articles to which his offer extended, were the renouncing of his orders, the ordination of ministers, the holding of conventicles, and the calling of synods. The Mar-Prelate libels he utterly disclaimed, but upon other pieces, of something like the same character, although himself author of none such, he professed his readiness to answer. For silence upon any other points, he expressed himself willing to give reasons. If these were deemed unsatisfactory, he would patiently undergo any punishment awarded by the court of High Commission[1]. Before this tribunal, after his first appearance in September, he stood twice during the following month[2]. In the course of which two examinations, his offers appear to have been elicited[3]. He very fairly pleaded against going farther, that he might prejudice others likely to decline the oath under any circumstances. His own qualified acceptance of it seems to have been rejected, and he was remanded to the Fleet; where he long remained. Burghley suggested to Whitgift the propriety of absenting himself, while his old antagonist stood before the High Commission, and this prudent advice was taken[4].

---

[1] "In his prayer before his sermons (at Banbury, 1589) he uses thus to say, *Because they* (meaning the bishops) *which ought to be pillars in the Church, do band themselves against Christ, and his truth, therefore, O Lord, give us grace and power, all, as one man, to set ourselves against them.* Which words, by way of emphasis, he would often repeat." (PAULE'S *Whitgift.* 62.) This charge forms the eleventh article of the allegations, from which Cartwright was required to clear himself, upon oath. The article states him to have used this inflammatory language "at sundry times." Neither Neal nor Mr. Price mentions it.

[2] Sept. 1, 1590. FULLER. b. ix. p. 197.

---

[1] "25. *Item*, That for, and in the behalf of the Church of England, he penned, or procured to be penned, all, or some part, of a little book, intituled in one part, *Disciplina Ecclesiæ sacra Verbo Dei descripta*, and in the other part, *Disciplina Synodica ex Ecclesiarum usu, &c.* And after it was perused by others, whom he first acquainted therewith, he recommended the same to the censures and judgements of moe brethren (being learned preachers) and some others, assembled by his means, for that, and other like purposes: Which, after deliberation, and some alterations, was by them, or most of them, allowed, as the only lawful Church government, and fit to be put in practice; and the ways and means for practising thereof in this realm, were also then, or not long after, agreed or concluded upon by them."—FULLER. b. ix. p. 201.

[2] "The copy of these articles were found by a friend in Mr. Travers his study, after his death, who as kindly communicated, as I have truly transcribed them."—*Ibid.* 198.

Contemporary proceedings, apparently far less capable of extenuation, were instituted against John Udal, formerly minister at Kingston-upon-Thames. In this cure he incurred a sentence of suspension from the archdeacon's official, and he then remained six months without clerical employment[5]. His professional excellence, however, being, in many points, unquestionable[6], and his opinions Disciplinarian, some of that party procured the earl of Huntingdon's concurrence, and found a church for him at Newcastle-upon-Tyne[1]. Without waiting for legal authority, he entered upon his new employment[2]. The preaching of a strong partisan was not likely to make such of the townspeople as differed from him, and fell under his lash, overlook an irregular appointment. He soon, accordingly, left Newcastle in custody[3]. After some preliminary appearances in London, he was tried for felony, at the Croydon summer assizes. The ground of this charge was a prefatory passage to the *Demonstration of Discipline*, reflecting offensively upon the prelacy[4].

---

[1] Cartwright to Burghley. Nov. 4, 1590. Strype. *Whitgift.* ii. 27.

[2] *Ibid.* 25.

[3] He wrote to Burghley, that "this was the sum of what passed at both their meetings." (*ut supra.*) Fuller speaks of him as utterly refusing the oath, Sept. 1.

[4] Burghley to Whitgift. Oct. 14, 1590. (Strype. *ut supra.* 25.) Both the October sessions were, probably, after that date, and it is evident, that the archbishop was not at St. Paul's in September.

[5] Neal. i. 444. He had been previously suspended, in 1586.—Price. i. 380.

[6] "He was a learned man,

---

blameless for his life, powerful in his praying, and no less profitable than painful in his preaching. For as Musculus in Germany, if I mistake not, first brought in the plain, but effectual manner of preaching, by use and doctrine, so Udal was the first who added reasons thereunto, the strength and sinews of a sermon. His English-Hebrew grammar he made whilst in prison, as appears by a subscription in the close thereof."—FULLER. 222.

[1] NEAL. *ut supra.*

[2] "There was neither bishop of the diocese, nor archbishop of York, at that time."—Udal's answer to John Young, Bishop of Rochester, one of the Commissioners, Jan 13, 1590. (*Ibid.*) This is, however, a subterfuge; means of exercising the jurisdiction of a see being always in action, although the see itself may be vacant. It appears, besides, that Udal spent about a year at Newcastle. Even, therefore, if there had really been any interruption in the ordinary course of ecclesiastical authority, on his entrance, there must have been subsequent opportunity to bring his appointment under regular cognisance. But he could feel little or no doubt that the northern authorities would be influenced by the suspension awarded in the south; and he, probably, chose to consider, that a call, as the phrase goes, from his congregation, was his best warrant for preaching.

[3] "He was sent-for up to London by the Lord Hunsdon, and the lord chamberlain, in the name of the whole privy council. Mr. Udal set out December 29th, 1589."—NEAL. *ut supra.*

[4] "*The indictment against John Udal, late of London, Clerk.*

"*Deum præ oculis suis non habens, sed instigatione diabolica seductus, et seditiose intendens et machinans ad rebellionem movend. et suscitand. infra hoc regnum &c. ult. die Octobris, anno regni dict. dnæ regin.* 30, at East Mouldsey; then and there set forth in English, a certain, wicked, scandalous, and seditious book, entitled, *A Demonstration of the truth of that Dis-*

He was not proved author of the work itself, nor is this even the general belief. He seems, however, to have written the libellous preface, and he would neither express any disapprobation of the principles which the book maintained, nor throw any light upon its authorship. Only depositions of absent witnesses were produced against him, but the jury were assured that the proof was sufficient, and he was found guilty of publishing a seditious libel. Legal subtlety strained a writing against the bishops into a virtual writing against the queen, whose officers they were[1]. Even that age rather shrank

---

cipline which Christ hath prescribed in his Word, for the Government of the Church, &c. in all tymes and places, until the end of the world."

The passages alleged against him in this indictment, were these: "Who can, without blushing, deny you (speaking to the bishops) to be the cause of all ungodliness? seeing that government is that which giveth leave unto a man to be any thing save a sound Christian, in retaining that Popish hierarchy first reigning in the midst of the mystery of iniquity, and that filthy sink of the canon law, which was invented and patched together for the confirming and increasing of the kingdom of Antichrist: *ad magnum scandalum dict. dnæ reginæ, et subversionem legum hujus regni, et incitationem rebellionis infra hoc regnum Angl. contra pacem et in contemptum ejusd. dnæ reginæ nunc, coron. et dignitatem suas, et contra formam statuti, in hujusmodi casu ordinat. et provis.* (From the MSS. of Sergeant Puckering, before whom, and Baron Clark, Udal was tried. STRYPE. *Annals.* iv. 28.) The statute under which he was indicted was 23 Eliz. c. 2. It made the publication of seditious libels a capital felony, and was provoked by the incendiary tracts that came from the Romish seminaries.

[1] "His trial, like most other political trials of that age, disgraces the name of English justice. It consisted mainly in a pitiful attempt by the court to entrap him into a confession that the imputed libel was of his writing, as to which their proof was deficient." (HALLAM. *Const. Hist.* i. 279.) "It may be remarked, on this, as on other occasions, that Udal's trial is evidently published by himself; and a defendant, especially in a political proceeding, is apt to give a partial colour to his own case." (*Ibid.* note.) The second extract rather qualifies the first. Contemporaries evidently were far from agreed as to any hardship in this case. "John Udall, a man utterly unlearned, and very factious, was, as you have heard, condemned upon the statute of 23 Eliz. 2, and for divers other

from extremities with a clergyman, undoubtedly no worse than rash, misguided, and intemperate. Hence, on some qualified submission, he was removed from the bar without any sentence, and great exertions were made to wring from him, subsequently, a full acknowledgment of error. He seems to have been far from unconcerned for life, and was under great anxiety about his wife and family. But his haughty spirit struggled violently against any compromise of the principles to which he stood committed. He would merely allow that some expressions in the obnoxious piece were intemperately penned[1]. Such a con-

---

disorders mentioned in the inditement. That it was justly and equally done, the greatness of the offence, being faction and sedition; the sincere and upright dealing of those honourable persons, that then were judges; the allowance of others, the most reverend and learned judges of the land, resolving on the case, the indifferencie of the jurie; the clemencie of her Majesties government; the witnesses and proofes; the favour offered to the prisoner; the obstinacie of the partie, the testimonie of all that was present, can declare." (SUTCLIFFE. *An Answere to certaine calumnious petitions*, &c. p. 47.) It appears, that Udal denied the bishops to be one of the three estates of the realm. Sutcliffe justly contends that the bishops are "one of the three estates of Parliament, and the cleargie one of the three estates of the realm." (48.) The heathens, he says, reckoned but two estates, "the nobilitie and commons, *senatum et plebem.* Christians ever reckoned the ecclesiasticall state, one: neither doth any lawyer say contrary." An anonymous lawyer is, however, mentioned, who said, without any proof, that Parliament consisted of three parts, the Prince, the Lords, and the Commons. This view gained ground, in spite of its inconsistency with usage and reason, as democratic and dissenting principles extended.

[1] He was required to admit, "I, John Udal, have been heretofore by due course of law convicted of felony, for penning or setting forth a certain book, called the *Demonstration of Discipline.* Wherein false, slanderous, and seditious matters are contained against her Majesty's prerogative royal, her crown and dignity, and against the laws and government ecclesiastical and temporal by law under her Highness, and tending to the erecting of a new form of government, contrary to her said laws." Feb. 19, 1591, he offered to admit, "Although I cannot disavow the cause and substance of the doctrine debated in it, which I must needs acknowledge to be holy, and (so far as I conceive of it) agreeable to the word of God,

cession was deemed insufficient, and the unhappy prisoner, at the following Lent assize, in Southwark, received capital sentence among convicted felons. The queen, however, contented with reducing him to silence, forbade execution[1]. At length, prison and misery superseded farther forbearance. The condemned minister passed many months of wearing suspense, and then sank under a weight of suffering[2]. He was naturally considered a martyr to the Disciplinarian cause, and a large

---

yet I confess the manner of writing of it is such in some part as may worthily be blamed, and might provoke her Majesty's just indignation therein." (STRYPE. *Annals.* iv. 36, 37.) Either the judges were unfavourably impressed upon his trial, or spoke of him harshly to flatter their superiors. He complains of their observations upon the circuit, in a spirited letter to Puckering, from the White Lion prison, Nov. 11, 1590.—*Ibid.* 38.

[1] "Her excellent Majesty hath vouchsafed of her gracious clemency, hitherto to forbid the taking away of my life." (Udal to Burghley, Feb. 2, 1591. STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 39.) Sir G. Paule says that Archbishop Whitgift obtained his pardon (53), and Mr. Hallam, who is generally hard enough upon that prelate, attributes the prolongation of Udal's life to his intercession. Strype was of the same opinion. Execution was, probably, never intended; for Bancroft, then chaplain to Chancellor Hatton, wrote to Sergeant Puckering, previously to the Surrey Lent assizes, to sentence, if the prisoner should continued intractable, but to stay execution. Subsequently, the Turkey merchants would have sent him abroad as their chaplain, and Whitgift consented, if they would be bound that he should stay until he got the queen's license to come home. This condition Udal rejected, but it does not seem clear that he might not have eventually gone without such an engagement, if his life had continued.

It is not unlikely that criminal prosecutions against Protestants were partly owing to complaints of Romanists, that, although not the only religious transgressors of the law, they were the only sufferers for transgression. "It is a manifest untruth which the libeller setteth down, that there hath been no punishment done upon those which in any of the forsaid kinds have broken the laws, and disturbed the church and state; and that the edge of the law hath been only turned upon the pretended catholics: for the examples are very many, where, according to the nature and degree of the offence, the correction of such offenders hath not been neglected." —BACON. *Observations on a Libel.* Works. Lond. 1803. iii. 61.

[2] In the beginning of 1593.

attendance of the party paid mournful honours to his corpse, as it was lowered, near that of Bishop Boner, into an untimely grave[1]. This melancholy case retains considerable importance among Dissenting and political enemies to the memory of Elizabeth. But Udal really was very wide of the liberality which all such historical speculators claim. One of the hardships of which he complained in the Gate-house, was his confinement among "seminary priests, traitors, and professed Papists[2]." If particulars were known, a Romanist would, probably, say, even of the second parties, that religion was their only treason.

In the earlier years of the queen, Romish prepossessions prevailed extensively among lawyers. But Travers had so filled the Temple pulpit, as to form a large Puritanical party at the bar. To the bias thus imbibed, is attributed a celebrated legal case[3]. Robert Cawdrey, formerly a schoolmaster, had obtained, under Burghley's patronage, the rectory of South Luffenham, in Rutlandshire. Upon this he lived several years, rearing a numerous family, and seemingly rendering important services to his parish. But he had conceived an antipathy to the Common Prayer, and, besides taking liberties as to the use of it, he occasionally seasoned his sermons with attacks upon it. At length, his endeavours to undermine the institutions that gave bread to himself and his household, brought him under cognizance of the High Commission Court. By this, his living was sequestered, and the bishop of Peterborough sent a chaplain of his own to serve the church[1]. Cawdrey's imprudence having thus reduced him to beggary, he shewed some signs of relenting. But he had a vein of bigoted, intractable insolence at bottom, which withheld him from giving any real satisfaction[2]. After long delay, he was, accordingly, deprived. Some of his legal friends incited him to dispute the sentence; maintaining that the commissioners had no ground for it, but the act of the queen's first year; which was insufficient for their purpose. The case was argued, in the Exchequer chamber, before all the judges, in Hilary term, this year, and Dr. Aubrey, a civilian, who acted as commissioner when Cawdrey was deprived, admitted that the Act of

---

[1] In St. George's church-yard, Southwark. (FULLER. 223.) It is not unworthy of remark, that Udal left a son, named Ephraim, who took orders, and obtained the rectory of St. Augustin's, by St. Paul's, London, from which he was sequestered, in 1643, for the publication of books against the Long Parliament's hostility to bishops and cathedrals. He brands that famous assembly with hypocrisy and sacrilege; so different were his views from his father's. As a preacher, he was highly popular, and Fuller pronounces him "a solid and pious divine."

[2] NEAL. i. 446.

[3] COLLIER. ii. 634.

---

[1] Cawdrey was sequestered in 1587; he had then been at South Luffenham sixteen years. He had previously taught school seven or eight years.—STRYPE. *Aylmer*. 84.

[2] In a letter to Burghley, March 22, 1588, he pronounces "these lord bishops the greatest enemies her Majesty had—indirect causes of the rebellion in 1569—countenancers of non-residents and idle shepherds—extreme dealers against godly ministers, who did not observe the Popish ceremonies —imperfect observers even of the Common Prayer-Book—persecutors of others for the very doctrine that had been preached and printed by themselves." Of the Common Prayer, he said in the pulpit, *It is a vile book: fy upon it.* (*Ib*. 88.) Neal says that, "he pleaded with tears his wife and eight poor children that had no maintenance," and talks of his inability to "mollify the hearts of the commissioners." (*Hist. Pur.* i. 460.) A Dissenting minister would be likely to find a family's need no protection against dismissal, if he used his pulpit to attack the very principles that had placed him in it. Cawdrey was really used with considerable forbearance. The court passed judgment originally, in December, 1586, but did not sentence, in hope of his conformity, until May 30 following. Probably, he might have made his peace, at any time almost, in the succeeding four years, but Whitgift informed Burghley, that no persuasions would induce him to subscribe like other ministers.—STRYPE. *Aylmer*. 97.

Supremacy was not a sufficient warrant[1]. It was, however, insisted, that this act conferred no fresh powers upon the crown, but merely declared anew such as were inherent in it, and had really been exercised by it, from the very foundation of the monarchy. The High Commission Court, it was, therefore, contended, had no occasion to narrow its proceedings by the Act of Supremacy, but might safely exercise any jurisdiction lawfully vested in the queen's ancestors. In these views, the judges concurred, and accordingly confirmed Cawdrey's deprivation. The case against him was conducted by Sir Edward Coke, Solicitor General, who tracked the royal supremacy, through every period of English history. This display of historical learning was highly disgusting to the Romanists. Their tactics require the dissemination of a belief, that Henry and Elizabeth arbitrarily overthrew the papal supremacy, until then inseparably united with the English constitution. Coke shewed the pope's power over England to have been always the mere creature of foreign artifice, and domestic connivance. No reign had formally acknowledged it, and every reign had, more or less, resisted it[2]. Usurpation, therefore, was branded indelibly upon every instance of its exercise. Nor is it easy to read Coke's elaborate argument, without regarding Englishmen, who would give Italians power over their native country, as deceived into opinions, equally unconstitutional, and unpatriotic[1].

---

[1] Aubrey to Burghley. July 18, 1591. (STRYPE. *Aylmer.* 95.) It is plain from Sutcliffe, that illegality was commonly fastened upon this case. He says, "That Cawdry was punished by order of lawe is apparant, for that statute doeth authorize the high Commissioners to proceede according to their Commission. If any fault was therein committed, it was that he was used with so much lenitie. Never was any more obstinate, nor could any man have more favour, especially without desert; for neither had he any learning, nor other good qualitie, nor was any more factious." In the margin it is said, "His cause was almost two years in handling, his conformitie being continually expected."—*An Answere to certaine calumnious petitions*, &c. 60.

[2] SIR EDWARD COKE'S *Reports.* Lond. 1777. Pt. V. viii.

The Disciplinarian party incurred considerable odium from the phrenzy of a maniac, whose disorder took a direction from it. William Hacket, a maltster of Oundle, had imbibed a violent affection for Puritanism, mingled as usual among lunatics, with anxiety to play the sovereign, and with some degree of lust. He roamed about in various directions, occasionally being placed under restraint, and severely beaten. These troubles he laid upon witchcraft, and Satan. Such an unfortunate person would easily find, at any time, weak or disordered intellects, to look upon his ravings as oracular. This view needed little for securing reception under a scanty measure of general knowledge, and civilisation. The most conspicuous converts to Hacket's insane pretensions were Edmund Coppinger, and Henry Arthington, gentlemen by birth, but needy, and staunch Disciplinarian fanatics. These crazy men were deluded into a belief that Hacket was, in fact, an emanation from our Saviour himself, come down from heaven to reign over Europe, and, of course, to supersede existing sovereignties. Upon such ridiculous fancies, were built those charges of high treason and conspiracy, which found employment for learned lawyers; instead of physicians and keepers; under whose cognizance the whole affair ought regularly to have fallen. All the three left a house near the Thames, where Hacket was lodging, in a fit of religious madness, and running through the streets, calling out, *Jesus Christ is come, with his fan in hand: Repent!* at length halted in Cheapside. A crowd soon gathering around, they mounted an empty cart, and proclaimed their pitiable delusions. Coppinger and Arthington were pronounced two prophets, one of judgment, the other of mercy. The three being necessarily taken into custody, were treated as political offenders: an absurdity rendered most excusable by the recollection of Muncer's Anabaptistical outrages in Germany, which immediately rose in thoughtful minds. On his trial, it appeared that Hacket had not only declared the queen deposed, but had also defaced her arms, and run a bodkin through her picture. Upon such grounds, the unhappy creature received sentence of death, as a traitor.

---

[1] "Against this case, so solidly debated, and so judiciously drawn up, when none of the Puritan professors could make any reply, Parsons, the Jesuit, undertook it; but spent more time in searching out contrary evidence, which might make for the Pope, than in disproving that which had been brought in behalf of the Queen."—HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 317.

In the interval before execution, he was brought, by some clergymen, into a state approaching sanity. But observing from the prison window an immense multitude in the street, when he was on the point of going forth to death, his diseased brain was immediately and violently fired anew. As he was dragged on a hurdle to the gibbet, he loudly uttered a string of vain-glorious blasphemies. These continuing to the last, were closed by a frantic struggle with the executioner. The crowd, however, could see nothing in this wretched spectacle, but calls for vengeance. It merely served as an excuse for savage shouts, to cut the victim quickly down, and begin mutilation before he had lost all feeling[1]. His friend Coppinger starved himself to death in Bridewell. Arthington shewed symptoms of relenting, and after some confinement, seems to have been pardoned[1]. This transaction fastened upon Puritanism, an imputation of political delinquency, which it had hitherto pretty well escaped. But the leading Puritans do not appear to have been compromised with Hacket, in any degree[2]. Nor were their opinions even implicated, really, farther than in fostering a tendency to fanaticism. From this, undoubtedly, mental disease rapidly passes into phrenzy.

---

[1] July 28.

In the following spring, Cartwright, and other Puritanical clergymen, imprisoned for declining the oath *ex officio*, made new exertions for liberation. Their first step was a petition to the council for a release upon bail[1]. The archbishop, however, disapproved, unless they would sign a submission, framed by the attorney-general, renouncing the Presbytery, and admitting assemblies, confederacies, and attempts, for ecclesiastical purposes, to be seditious and unlawful, without royal authority[2]. Not being prepared for any such surrender, they memorialised first Lord Burghley[3], then the queen[4]. The result, after some interval, was their deliverance upon a general engagement to conduct themselves peaceably[5]. Cartwright appears to have given bond for his appearance, at any time, upon a summons of twenty days[6]. He retired to his hospital at Warwick, and occasioned no farther uneasiness. He had come to an age, when passion is hushed, vanity stands rebuked, and this world is perceptibly gliding into another. Hence his future days were uninterruptedly spent in acquiring and strengthening such habits as alone are fitted for eternity. His old antagonist Whitgift, also hastening to the same goal, lived latterly upon terms of friendly intercourse with him. He had concurred in the propriety of his release, and rejoiced in seeing it so satisfactorily used. He sometimes even thought, that had not Cartwright stood so decidedly committed, his latter days would have been spent in complete conformity[1]. Nor was this view unreasonable. Long experience, and little expectation of life, give a sobriety to the mind, which is very uncommon, while the world is little known, and imagination teems with fascinating visions.

---

[1] *Conspiracy for Pretended Reformation*, by R. Cosin, LL.D., Dean of the Arches, and Official Principal to Abp. Whitgift. Lond. 1699: reprinted from a tract published by Authority, 1592. p. 128. The design of this tract is to exhibit Hacket, and his two prophets, as political conspirators. The facts of the case, however, being fully and fairly given, prove unquestionably that Hacket had long been insane. Of his two friends, the particulars are not so copiously supplied, but it is evident, that if not confirmed lunatics, they must have been very weak men, with a tinge of lunacy. Some contemporaries appear to have explained the whole case in this way, for Cosin takes considerable pains to prove the miserable parties sane. A more reasonable portion of his pamphlet details various particulars of the Anabaptistical outrages in Germany. These, undoubtedly, gave a lesson of caution, and would have warranted the government in consigning the three offenders to Bedlam. There is one particular worthy of notice in Cosin's tract, as an antidote to the calumnies in *Leicester's Commonwealth*, and other Popish libels. Arthington said of the queen, "she is least guilty of the common sins, but most abused of any prince that ever was, by those whom she hath most advanced." (70.) Romish enemies would have her believed "guilty of the common sins," but it is clear from these words of Arthington's, that such was not the general impression of his day, and it is worthy of remark, that his confederate, Coppinger, was a member of the royal household.

[2] "Mr. Cartwright wrote an apology for himself and his brethren against the aspersions of Dr. Sutcliff, in which he declares that he had never seen Hacket, nor Arthington, nor ever had any conference with them by letter, or message. Had there been any ground for this vile charge, we should, no doubt, have found it among their articles of impeachment."—NEAL. i. 463.

---

[1] This purpose is announced in a letter to Burghley, supplicating his favourable interference, dated Dec. 4, 1591.—STRYPE. *Annals.* iv. L. 101.

[2] "We, whose names are subscribed, each man for himself, do unfeignedly acknowledge and confess—that al synods, conventicles, assemblies, and attempts for any innovation, or alteration to be made within this realm, without her Majesties authority and assent, or for any ecclesiastical laws or government, are seditious and unlawful.

"That the ecclesiastical government now received and established by her Majesties authority in the Church of England, is lawful and allowable by the word of God. And that the government challenged, devised, or attempted to be executed by any presbyteries, or church-assembly, consisting of Doctors, Pastors, Elders, and Deacons, or of any of them, or any such like, not warranted by the laws of this realm, is not only unlawful, but also very dangerous for the state of this realm."—STRYPE. *Whitgift.* Append. v. iii. 261.

[3] March 1, 1591-2.—*Ibid.* VI. 262.

[4] April, 1592.—STRYPE. *Ann.* iv. 120. LX.

[5] STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 90.

[6] PRICE. i. 396.

The long imprisonment of so many popular ministers engendered arguments upon its legality. No judge, it was maintained, had authority to tender the oath *ex officio* in cases prejudicial to the parties[2]. Hence Cartwright and his friends were unjustly detained for declining it. They had merely refused explanation or defence, until an accuser came forward. Not only equity and reason could be pleaded here, but, besides the common law, also God's law, and even the canon law. No one of these required men to stand forth, sworn witnesses against themselves. Such views were branded with ignorance of law, but they were taken by many learned, penetrating, and active

---

[1] "Yea, the Archbishop hath been heard to say, that if Master Cartwright, had not so far ingaged himself as he did in the beginning, he thought verily he would in his latter time have been drawn to conformity. For when he was freed from his troubles, he oft repaired to the Archbishop, who used him kindly, and was contented to tolerate his preaching in Warwick divers years, upon his promise, that he would not impugn the laws, orders, and government in this Church of England, but persuade and procure, so much as he could, both privately and publickly, the estimation and peace of the same. Which albeit, he accordingly performed, yet when her Majesty understood by others that Master Cartwright did preach again (tho' temperately, according to his promise made to the Archbishop) she would by no means indure his preaching any longer without subscription; and grew not a little offended with the Archbishop for such connivency at him. Not long after Master Cartwright died rich, as it was said, by the benevolence and bounty of his followers." (PAULE's *Whitgift*. 72.) Attempts have been made in modern times to deprive Whitgift of all credit for his behaviour to Cartwright, but Sir G. Paule cites a passage from one of his own letters, acknowledging that "his Grace's favour proceeded from a frank disposition, without any desert of his own." Cartwright died in 1602. He seems to have said on his death-bed, that he "seriously lamented the unnecessary troubles he had caused in the Church, by the schism he had been the great fomenter of: and wished he was to begin his life again, that he might testify to the world the dislike he had of his former ways."—STRYPE. *Whitgift*. ii. 460.

[2] "*Officium* signifying the au-

thoritie and jurisdiction of the Judge, is that power whereby he may deale of himself, without the petition and instance of a partie. When no persecuter at all doth stirre in the matter; then the Court only doeth it in ductie to the Commonwealth, and to see sinne and disorder punished. Then is this enquirie termed *Officium* simply, or *Officium merum* by the Canon lawe, and by the Civill lawes *Officium nobile*, as of more woorth and dignitie, then the other course, which is by a partie, and at his petition and instance.—The next privilege by lawe yielded unto proceeding *of Office* in a criminall cause, which is denied to a prosecuter, yea, though he be not an accuser or partie; is, that the Judge, proceeding *of Office* may give an othe to the defendant to answere some criminall matter. But it is otherwise, when the suite is at the instance of a partie which prosecuteth, because the defendant ought not to be driven to furnish-up his adversaries intention. Thirdly, an Ordinarie, or delegate *ad universitatem causarum*, that proceedeth *of Office*, is not bound to make proofes of the *fame*, (saving before his superiour judge, if an appellation be brought and doe lie) because it sufficeth, that the *fame* is apparant, and knowen unto himselfe." (*An Apologie for Sundrie Proceedings by Jurisdiction Ecclesiasticall.* Lond. 1593. pt. 2. pp. 30. 36.)

"*By the common lawe, a man shall not be examined upon his othe in matters that sound to his reproach.*"—Crompton. 182.

"Crompton's word is no measure of lawe. The contrarie hereof is lawe, by the opinion of the most learned judges in England. It is the practise of the court of Chancerie: in the court of the councel of the marches, and principalitie of Wales: in the court of Starre-chamber: whereas the parties are examined upon their othes, upon perjuries, forgeries, and many other misdemeanors. Suppose it be at the instance of parties, which, notwithstanding, is not alwayes: yet it appeareth, that othes to discover things reprochfull to a man's selfe, be lawfull and very common, and most necessarie: and a simple lawyer was he, that understood not so much." (Sutcliffe. *An Answere to certaine calumnious petitions*, &c. 115.) "What marvel is it, if Crompton, a man of no judgement, hath been deceaved, seeing Fitzherbert hath also mistaken such matters?"—*Ib.* 167.

heads. Hence reasonings and information in their favour, soon circulated extensively. As a next step, almost all the powers of ecclesiastical courts, whether ordinary, or such as that of the High Commission, were daily called in question. A disposition was gaining ground to deny their jurisdiction in any other causes than testamentary and matrimonial[1]. Thus an imputation of illegality was not only fixed upon imprisonment for refusing the oath *ex officio*, but also upon the deprivations of puritanical incumbents. Their benefices, it was argued, were their freeholds, and consequently cognisable only by regular indictment, in a court of common law[2]. Attacks of this kind upon existing usages, rapidly made an impression beyond the suffering party with whom they originated. Many, who had no affection for Puritanism, became suspicious of the courses followed for its repression[3]. They were very far from any wish for such a yoke as the *Holy Discipline*, but they disapproved of all illegal means to keep it off their shoulders.

Whether such means might not unadvisedly have been used, was evidently doubted for a while, by some persons in authority. Certain civilians had instructions, therefore, to prepare a brief legal justification of the oath *ex officio*. Their statement was not intended for publicity, but it found a ready way to the divines and canonists of opposite sentiments. A refutation promptly followed, and was cautiously sent abroad. About the same time, a more laboured apology for the questioned proceedings, was undertaken by Richard Cosin, dean of the Arches. Forty copies of his tract were printed for the use of such as he wished to inform, or influence.

---

[1] Cosin. pt. 1. p. 6.

[2] *Ib.* Generall Preface.

[3] *Ib.* Generall Preface.

While this piece was in private circulation, Cosin saw the answer to the original justification. He now determined upon a regular publication of his matter, with numerous additions[1].

He produced an elaborate work, in three parts, containing an immense mass of such legal learning as chiefly concern ecclesiastical affairs[2]. The most important branch of his inquiry, was the consonance of recent prosecutions with English law. This he has treated with considerable success. He has adduced statutes, authorising ecclesiastical judges to examine upon oath, parties accused by common fame, or secret information, of matters penal, but not capital[3]. How far such laws may be fairly applicable to cases for which they were not specially provided, may still, however, be open to dispute. An age of extended knowledge and rational freedom would, indeed, refuse indignantly to power all such inquisitorial appliances. But Elizabeth's days were not so far advanced, and her ministry had safer legal grounds for pressing the oath *ex officio*, upon their Puritanical opponents, than hasty observers often fancy. It was not even without such authority as the suffering party itself habitually respected. Calvin and Geneva could be cited in its defence[4]. Disciplinarian principles were not, indeed, well suited for backing a clamour against oppression. They were essentially arbitrary and inquisitorial; not promising any end of persecution, but only that persecutors should change places[1].

---

[1] Epistle to the Reader.—COSIN'S *Apologie*.

[2] The first part shews what matters are allowed by common and statute law, to be under ecclesiastical cognizance: the second explains the two ways of proceeding criminally in ecclesiastical cases, *viz.* either by the accusation of a third party, or *ex Officio Judicis;* the third defends the imposition of oaths, for the discovery of a man's own offences, or those of his brethren.

[3] Pt. 3, ch. 8. p. 98.

[4] "It fortuned upon a time, that certain persons meeting together at one Widow Balthasar's house in Geneva to be merry, did there dance. Master Calvin, hearing of this horrible sin, forsooth, procured them all, both dancers and beholders, to be called before him and his Elders, in the

---

consistorie. When they appeared, Calvin took upon him to examine them, and used, as he termeth them, certain *holy obtestations*, that they should tell him truly, whether there were any such dancing, or no, where it was, and who danced, &c. They denied the matter wholly, which he expresseth Apostolike in these words, *Impudenter nobis et Deo mentiti sunt, They lied impudently to God, and us: Excandui: I grew pale with anger* (saith he) *and inveighed eagerly against such their contempt of God.* But they continued their contumacie. Whereupon Calvin (the matter, as he saith, being certainly known unto him,) protested before God, *Poenas tantæ perfidiæ daturos, That they should be punished for such their falsehood.* And because he could not otherwise get the truth from them, *Censui ut jurejurando ad veri confessionem adigerentur; I judged it meet*, saith he, *that by oath they should be compelled to confess the truth.* It should'seem, they made the like exceptions that our contumacious fellows do make. And one Henrich, a minister, as it seemeth, who, as I take it, danced not, but did in some sort, by way of supposition, if any such dancing had been, take upon him to defend it, as not being a matter to keep such a stirre about, alleged the very same place that Cartwright did in the Consistorie at Paul's, and the which all the rest of that brotherhood do commonly allege, *viz. Against an elder receive no accusation, but under two or three witnesses.* But how was this allegation liked-of? Surely, it was laughed-at, and termed by Calvin, *Altercatio non illepida, A pleasant jest.* It seemeth also that beside the threatening speeches mentioned, there were other used in like manner, which did more terrifie them. For, saith Calvin, *Tandem adjeci, &c. At the length, I added further, that they must build themselves another city, and live therein by themselves, except they would be contained here under the yoak of Christ* (he meaneth their Consistorie) *and that as long as they lived in Geneva, they must strive but in vain not to obey the laws there.* Well, by what means they were drawn unto their oath, I will not stand to it; but sworn they were, and confessed all. Whereupon, *Omnes in carcerem conjecti, They were all cast into prison.*"—BANCROFT. *Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline.* 250.

[1] "They called the spirit of opposition, a tender conscience, and complained of persecution, because they wanted power to persecute others." (WALTON'S *Hooker.* 143.) "The Inquisition of the Consistorie is like the Spanish Inquisition, and the papal proceeding. For as in the Spanish Inquisition, so in the Consistorie, a man is called, knoweth no accuser, and whether

In all cases, the oath was not refused. Some of the ministers called in question, admitted an obligation to answer interrogatories put by lawful authority, and argued against silence as an useless provocation, when examiners acted with sufficient previous knowledge. Under this advantage, more or less completely, all the prosecutions of Puritanical ecclesiastics were conducted. Numerous letters had been intercepted, and so much private information gained, that but few of the obnoxious movements remained for discovery. The government merely wanted such proof as would suffice for judicial forms. This came, however, with an ill grace from individuals implicated. It is true, that no new particulars of importance were gleaned from them, and that their evidence revealed, perhaps, little or nothing unquestionably illegal. But it furnished proof of Puritanical organization, and indicated parties who might now, with tolerable safety, be selected for punishment. Hence the clergymen who took the oath, naturally fell under considerable obloquy. For themselves they gained freedom from farther molestation; a privilege that rendered them additionally odious to their former friends. In this unpopular obedience to authority, the way seems to have been led by Thomas Stone, rector of Warkton, in Northamptonshire. Eight others are known to have been found similarly communicative[1].

---

hee confesse or not, hee is sure to abide the order of the Consistorie, and what they command the civill judge performeth. And therefore, if all must away that is borrowed from the pope, away must the Consistorie goe, with their excommunication of princes, and their absolute tyrannie." — SUTCLIFFE. *An Answere to certaine calumnious petitions, &c.* 161.

[1] "The worst part of their confession was their discovering the names of the brethren that were present, which brought them into trouble.—It is certain they purchased their own liberties at the expence of their brethren's, for they had the favour to be dismissed, and lived without disturbance afterwards." (NEAL. i. 461, 462.) Strype has printed (*Whit-*

Subscription to authorized systems of Disciplinarian principles, was very fairly made one point of inquiry. It is obviously necessary to every society, that some satisfactory test should be exacted from its members, as a bond of union. The Presbyterians, therefore, were not blameable in adopting the usual precautions for self-preservation. Unfortunately, however, for the credit of their consistency, declamations against subscription formed an important branch of their regular tactics against the Church. When bishops called for it from individuals puritanically biassed, it became a grievous hardship and oppression. When a *classis*, or other such assembly, met, those who shared in its deliberations were expected previously to subscribe the *Holy Discipline*[1].

---

gift. Append. IX. X. vol. iii. 271. 282) two sets of queries put to these defendants, with their answers. From these, it appears that the Northampton *classis* denied the name of *brethren* to ministers who did not belong to their own party, and pronounced episcopal ordination merely a civil ceremony to be undergone for legal security, none being really ministers until allowed by the brethren of the *classis*. The same *classis*, however, did not go so far as to unchurch all bodies refusing to join the Disciplinarians. It only pronounced such congregations less fully churches. But at a conference, in London, it was determined, to use all suitable occasions, for inculcating the Discipline, "as a part of the Gospel." Many of the questions relate to politics, but the answers clear the Disciplinarians pretty effectually from political suspicions. Their association was rather the parent of a political party, than one itself.

[1] Littleton and Johnson, two of the ministers who took the oath *ex officio*, deposed that "none gave voice but such as had subscribed." (STRYPE. *Whitgift.* Append. IX. iii. 280.) Stone and Cleaveley contradicted this, but the former deponents must have given the general usage. A few persons might have been admitted in the deliberations without formal subscription, but even these were known to be favourably disposed; (a very different case from that of such as denied or scrupled subscription in the Church.) The great bulk in a Disciplinarian conference evidently stood committed by a formal subscription. Decency would hardly allow the rigid exclusion of a few known friends, too cautious as yet for such a decisive step. "Th. Cartw. and his fellowes, contrary to the sta-

The Church, it seems, was really less rigorous in her demands. The laxity as to subscription that prevailed in the queen's earlier years, appears never to have ceased. Bishops took upon themselves to dispense with that security, in a manner which was neither warrantable nor politic[1]. The truth is, that severe and arbitrary principles were not uniformly at work under Elizabeth. They had only occasional seasons of activity. Temporising, to a degree unknown in later times, was her ordinary policy in ecclesiastical affairs. Conscious of sound information, and right intentions, she seems to have reckoned upon justice for her opinions and herself, from the slow operations of national good sense. Her council-board, also, was never without influential spirits with a strong puritanical bias. Hence there was continually a connivance at irregularities, favourable upon the whole to their growth; far from so, to that colouring of despotic

---

tutes and lawes of the realme, assembled in secrete manner, made lawes, and subscribed them, and published them among themselves: at Warwicke, Cambridge, London, &c., the actes thereof are sufficient evidence."—SUTCLIFFE. *An Answere to certaine calumnious petitions, &c.* 59.

[1] "How carelessly subscription is exacted in England, I am ashamed to report. Such is the retchlessness of many of our bishops on the one side, and their desire to be at ease and quietness to think upon their own affairs; and on the other side, such is the obstinacy and intolerable pride of that factious sort, as that betwixt both sides, either subscription is not at all required, or if it be, the bishops admit them so to qualifie it, that it were better to be omitted altogether. If the best and the learnedest man in Christendome were in Geneva, and should oppose himself to any thing that the Church there holdeth, if he escaped with his life, he might thank God: but he should be sure not to continue as a minister there. There is no church established in Christendome so remisse in this point, as the Church of England: for in effect, every man useth and refuseth what he listeth. Some few of late have been restrained, who had almost raised the land into an open sedition. But else they follow their own fancies, and may not be dealt withall (forsooth) for fear of disquietness."—BANCROFT. *Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline.* 249.

intolerance which is often thrown over this remarkable reign.

A new parliament, chiefly summoned for the relief of financial difficulties, opened ominously for the Romanists[1]. The famous lawyer, Edward Coke, solicitor-general, being elected speaker by the House of Commons, entered upon his office with an elaborate speech that bore evidence of recent attention to Cawdrey's case. After dwelling upon the aggressions of Rome and Spain, he passed on to a statutable refutation of papal claims over England. In every reign, from Henry III. to Edward VI., he cited a statute maintaining the royal supremacy. Sergeant Puckering, now knighted, and become lord-keeper, having officially to speak next, added proofs of the supremacy under Henry II. and the Saxon kings[2]. Papal partisans were thus branded as unpatriotic innovators, who blindly or corruptly offered violence to the constitution of their country. The practical evils of their politics had long furnished a theme for general remark and indignation. Popery lay under the undeniable infamy of eliciting a series of domestic treasons, and of crowning them by one of the most formidable foreign expeditions that had ever menaced England. While such facts were fresh in the memories of men, the court could find little difficulty in carrying coercive measures against adherents to Rome. It was thought advisable to use this facility, and recusants were disquieted by a bill of greater stringency than any that had hitherto been introduced[3].

On the following day, Morice, attorney of the Court of Wards, who had been Cawdrey's counsel, and undoubtedly was of his party, made a long premeditated speech upon puritanical grievances. His attacks were principally levelled at subscription, the oath *ex officio*, and release from custody under securities for future good behaviour. He was answered by Dalton, of Lincoln's Inn; who argued for the legality of recent proceedings in the episcopal courts, but laid his principal stress upon the queen's prohibition of such debates when parliament was opened. Morice, though he had been seconded by Sir Francis Knollys, was not long in finding, that his disregard of this, however honourable to his zeal, had nothing of worldly prudence to recommend it. He was first placed under the custody of Sir John Fortescue, and eventually sent to Tutbury Castle, where he underwent an imprisonment of several years[1]. A similar invasion of the House's deliberative privileges was provoked by Elizabeth's habitual antipathy to legislative interference with the succession[1]. Such acts were tyrannical and impolitic, calling for the resistance that was ultimately fatal to them. It may be doubted whether they did violence to prescription, or known provisions of any kind. Hence they might seem rather unwise, than unconstitutional. Abstractedly, they bore the latter character, but usage concealed it from general observation. The age was, indeed, rude and arbitrary. Even the crown's legislative speeches often ludicrously remind one of a pedagogue surrounded by full-grown schoolboys[2]. Elizabeth found society under circumstances that seemingly warranted such assumption, and candour must allow her more excuse than is often conceded for having left it so.

---

[1] Feb. 19.—D'Ewes. 456.

[2] *Ibid.* 459, 460.

[3] Feb. 26. The bill was entitled, *An Act for continuing her Majesties Subjects in more due Obedience.*—Townsend's *Historical Collections.* Lond. 1680. p. 55.

---

[1] Wedn. Feb. 28. "This morning, Mr. Morris was sent for to court, and from thence he was committed to Sir John Fortescue's keeping." (TOWNSEND's *Historical Collections*. 61.) The speaker had been summoned to court on the preceding day, and the next morning he gave the House the particulars of his reception. The queen, as usual upon such occasions, was extremely high, and Coke talks of himself as quite frightened. Elizabeth reminded him of her powers to call and dissolve parliaments, and to refuse the royal assent; then of her charge delivered by the lord keeper, that she did not mean the House "to meddle with matters of state, or in causes ecclesiastical." Hence, "she wondered that any would be of so high commandment to attempt a thing contrary to that which she had so expressly forbidden; wherefore with this she was highly displeased." She concluded with commanding that no bills upon the forbidden subjects should be introduced, and that if any such were introduced notwithstanding, the speaker, upon his allegiance, should forbear to read them. (*Ibid.* 63.) Morice was "kept some years in Tutbury Castle, discharged from his office in the dutchy, and disabled from any practice in his profession as a common lawyer."—HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 320.

The House of Commons being thus arbitrarily closed against puritanical complaints, the Consistorians themselves could, notwithstanding, keep fully abreast of their time in despotic intolerance. The bill against recusancy was gradually modified, so as to press upon Protestant absentees from church, even more severely than upon Romish[1]. In this state it passed both Houses, as did another persecuting statute. Thus the puritanical party, whose exertions, undoubtedly, rendered great eventual services to civil and religious liberty, stands forth as an accomplice in a gross violation of both[1]. As it evidently

---

[1] Sat. Feb. 24. "This day Mr. Peter Wentworth and Sir Henry Bromley delivered a petition unto the lord keeper, therein desiring the lords of the Upper House to be suppliants with them of the Lower House unto her majesty, for entailing the succession to the crown; whereof a bill was ready drawn by them. Her majesty was highly displeased therewith, after she knew thereof, as a matter contrary to her former straight commandment, and charged the council to call the parties before them. Sir Thomas Henage presently sent for them, and after speech with them, commanded them to forbear coming to the parliament, and not to go out from their several lodgings." —Townsend's *Historical Collections*. 54.

[2] The Keeper Puckering said, "Her majesty hath further willed me to signify unto you, that the calling of this parliament now is not for the making of any more new laws and statutes, for there are already a sufficient number both of ecclesiastical and temporal; and so many there be, that rather than to burthen the subject with more to their grievance, it were fitting an abridgement were made of those there are already. Wherefore it is her majesties pleasure that the time be not spent therein. But the principal cause of this parliament is, that her majesty might consult with her subjects for the better withstanding of those intended invasions which are now greater than were ever heretofore heard of. And whereas heretofore it hath been used that many have delighted themselves in long orations, full of verbosity and vain ostentations, more than in speaking things of substance; the time that is precious would not be thus spent."—D'Ewes. 458.

---

[1] "The statute of the 35th Elizabeth, cap. 1, has no other title than this, *An Act for Punishment of Persons obstinately refusing coming to Church, and persuading others to impugn the Queen's authority in Ecclesiastical Causes.* The body of the act mentions no other crimes but not *coming to Church or Chapel, or persuading others not to come, or being present at any unlawful assembly or conventicle, under colour or pretence of religious exercise.* All persons offending in these particulars are to be committed to prison without bail or mainprize, till they conform. If they do not conform within three months, they are to abjure the realm, to go into banishment, and to forfeit their goods and chattels for ever. And if they refuse to abjure and depart, or return again without license, they are adjudged felons, and to suffer as in case of felony, without benefit of clergy. —And 'tis very remarkable that there is a proviso in this statute, *That no Popish Recusant shall be compelled or bound to abjure, by virtue of this Act.* Such was her majesty's tenderness for the Papists, while she was putting to death Protestant Dissenters." (NEAL'S *Review of the Principal Facts objected-to in the First Volume of the History of the Puritans.* Lond. 1734. p. 63.) Under this statute, recusants were also to forfeit the income of a real estate, during their lives. "Even these penalties were not thought sufficiently severe: by the second act of the same year, popish recusant convicts were ordered not to remove five miles from the place of their abode, and if they removed to a greater distance, they were subjected to a similar penalty: a jesuit, seminary, or other massing priest, who, on his examinations before a magistrate, should refuse to answer directly, whether he were a jesuit, seminary, or a massing priest, was to be committed to prison, and to remain there, till answer, without bail or mainprize." (BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* iii. 250.) "From the 35th Eliz. ch. 2, arose also the distinction between papists, and persons professing the popish religion, and popish recusants convict. Notwithstanding the frequent mention in the statute-book, of papists, and persons professing the popish religion, neither the statutes themselves, nor the cases adjudged upon them, present a clear notion of the acts or circumstances, that, in the eye of the law, constitute *a papist, or a person professing the popish religion.* When a person of that description absented himself from church, he filled the

---

legal description of *a popish recusant.* When he was convicted, in a court of law, of absenting himself from church, he was termed in the law *a popish recusant convict.* To this must be added the *constructive recusancy*, hereinafter mentioned to be incurred by a refusal to take the oath of supremacy." (*Ibid.* i. 172.) Mr. Butler thinks English Romanism to have owed this new severity to a scurrilous libel, in favour of the Spanish party, published under the name of *Andrew Philopater*, and attributed to Persons, but denied by him.

[1] "Though the House had clearly evinced its disposition to redress the wrongs of the Puritans, it possessed but little sympathy with the more violent sectaries, who denounced the constitution, and seceded from the worship of the Church. These were as yet regarded with suspicion and dread, even by many who complained of the secularity, and felt the intolerance of the bishops. So rapid had been the progress of this sentiment, that Cartwright was now in the rear of many of his contemporaries, and was regarded as the head of the more moderate Puritans. He had been censured by his predecessors for denouncing the episcopal order, and for addressing himself to the parliament for the correction of ecclesiastical abuses; but while he remained stationary, others passed onward, and advocated opinions in comparison with which his were moderate and tame. This circumstance explains the fact, which would otherwise be unaccountable, that this parliament should pass a law so foreign from the temper of many of its debates, and so contrary to the example of all its predecessors. The law was directed, not against the Puritans, but against the Brownists. The former would have been favoured, the latter were denounced. The one party were regarded as a conscientious body, whose labours were eminently useful to the Church; the other were condemned as reckless adventurers, whose principles were destructive of religion, and subversive of the commonwealth." (PRICE. *Hist. Nonconf.* i. 404.) This passage may serve to vindicate Elizabeth's general religious policy. First, nothing was wanted, but abolition of the habits, and a few ceremonies; then, the *holy discipline* was insisted upon as an integral member of the Gospel; now, people who entertained this opinion, were "in the rear," others had "passed onward," while they "remained stationary," leaving them "moderate and tame,"—qualities that have rarely gained popularity. The parties, however, left behind, had no thought of abandoning any available advantage. Nothing could be too bad to say of a bishop and his court; but such as had

came to parliament in its usual strength, such seeming dereliction of principle has occasioned surprise. But Puritanism was now jostled seriously by rival pretensions to popular favour. Within the House of Commons, religious discontent was yet monopolised by itself. Out of doors, it had a most formidable competitor in the principles of Brown, ultimately called Independency. Of these, little had lately been heard, and sanguine opponents thought them worn out and suppressed[1]. They were, however, now urged into fresh activity by the exertions of a new patron, named Barrow. The Brownists, or Barrowists, as they were henceforth indifferently styled, were no less hostile to the Disciplinarians, than to the Church. Hence both were equally bent upon their extinction. One subject of deliberation at Disciplinarian conferences, was the arrangement of plans for terminating the Romish and the Brownist schisms[2]. It had always been thought a Christian duty by admirers of the Consistory, to include Romanists among criminals. They now showed a similar intolerance towards their Brownist opponents. This is, however, the party which Elizabeth and her ministry have undergone so much obloquy for resisting. The government was embarked in no conflict with principles of free toleration, or enlightened civil liberty. Such principles appear to have been wholly

---

hard sayings for themselves, they thought worthy of banishment or hanging. Nor did they mean to overlook any power yet in their hands, for carrying this judgment into unsparing operation.

[1] "And as for those which we call Brownists, being, when they were at the most, a very small number of very silly and base people, here and there in corners dispersed, they are now, thanks be to God, by the good remedies that have been used, suppressed and worn out; so as there is scarce any news of them."—BACON. *Observations on a Libel, published this present year*, 1592. Works. iii. 60.

[2] Examination of Thomas Barbar.—STRYPE. *Whitgift*. Append. IX. iii. 274.

overlooked on every side. The queen was merely struggling against an exclusive sect, which aimed at the Church-establishment, and was ready to trample down opposition by the most tyrannical expedients[1]. The details of this resistance were often blameable; sufficient inquirers into Elizabethan history have no longer a word for the thing resisted.

Seemingly, to strike a greater terror into the Separatists, their leaders were capitally indicted, under an existing statute, while the parliament sate. The most conspicuous clergyman of their party, since Brown's retirement, was named John Greenwood. He does not appear to have possessed any striking talent, but where this is wanting, zeal or violence will commonly, notwithstanding, command a temporary popularity. That Greenwood had attracted considerable notice, is evident from his arrest, six years ago. His lay associate, Henry Barrow, long remarkable for a restless tongue, and a disputatious temper, suddenly grew serious, and may be considered as a second founder of the Separatists. He remained for some time undiscovered, but a search was on foot for his apprehension. He was of gentlemanly origin in Norfolk, and had been a member both of the University of Cambridge, and of Gray's Inn[2]. He does not appear, however, to have been admitted a barrister. Indeed, his early habits are charged with an irregularity, commonly fatal to professional acquirements, and which occasioned many severe comments when he came forward as a religious leader[1]. But although by-gone vice is always justly punished by such reflections, it may be superseded by fanaticism in minds really untainted by hypocrisy. The same intensity of impulse that has tempted one year into excessive pleasure, may guide the next, under pressure of remorse, into an overdone profession of religion. Barrow's mind was evidently liable to be thus led away. He traced his principles originally to Cartwright, but he eventually spoke of that celebrated leader and his party, as a closer kind of hypocrites, who "strained at a gnat, and swallowed a camel." They came occasionally to church, and thus avoided the character of Protestant recusants. They professed themselves members of the Church, and merely wanted to reform it in their own way. Barrow, with his friends, would hear of nothing but its destruction. They denounced it as no true church, its worship as idolatrous, its congregations as ungodly parish assemblies, its ministers as unauthorized, its government as antichristian. Such was their hatred of all set religious forms, that they would not even use the Lord's Prayer, and all printed catechisms they derided as the refuges for idleness, therefore disgraceful both to the framers and the users. Having adopted high ascetic notions, they denied the lawfulness of baptism to the children of such as did not reach their standard of sanctity; but they did not maintain the necessity of repeating that sacrament in cases where they thought it improperly administered. They did not disapprove of oaths, upon occasions deemed fitting by themselves; but they would not touch a Bible, or any substance, in swearing. In naming months and days, they seem to have anticipated some of the scruples which eventually became an integral portion of Quaker peculiarities[1].

---

[1] The Act against Protestant recusancy "being made to continue no longer than the end of the next session of parliament, was afterwards kept in force from session to session, till the death of the queen, to the great preservation of the peace of the kingdom, the safety of her majesty's person, and the tranquillity of the Church, free from thenceforth from any such disturbances of the Puritan faction, as had before endangered the foundations of it."—HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 322.

[2] The Examinations of Henry Barrowe, John Grenewood, and John Penrie, before the High Commissioners and Lordes of the Counsel. Penned by the Prisoners before their deaths. Printed 1586.—*Harleian Miscellany*, iv. 327—329.

---

[1] "Greenwood is but a simple fellow, Barrow is the man. And will sacrilegious people become Barrowists? I easily believe it. Like will to like. When Barrow by roisting and gaming had wasted himself, and was run so farre into many a man's debt that he durst not shew his head abroad, he bent his wits another way, and is now become a Julianist, devising by all means he can possibly imagine, his hypocrisie, railing, lying, and all manner of falsehood, even as Julian the Apostate did, how all the preferments which yet remain for learning, benefices, tythes, glebe-land, cathedral churches, bishops' livings, colleges, universities, and all, might be utterly spoyled and made a prey for banckrouts, cormorants, and such like atheists." (BANCROFT. *Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline.* 300.) The Brownists had not "been much known at all, had not Brown, their leader, written a pamphlet, wherein, as it came into his head, he inveighed more against logic and rhetoric, than against the state of the church; which writing was much read: and had not also one Barrow, being a gentleman of a good house, but one that lived in London, at ordinaries, and there learned to argue in table-talk, and so was very much known in the city and abroad, made a leap from a vain and libertine youth, to a preciseness in the highest degree: the strangeness of which alteration made him very much spoken of."—BACON. *ut supra.*

Barrow, the great patron of these opinions, having gone to see his friend Greenwood, then a prisoner, was recognised, and himself detained in custody[2]. Being taken immediately to Lambeth, he assumed there, as he did afterwards elsewhere towards the prelacy, a bold and saucy tone. To the judges and lay councillors his behaviour was always respectful. Thus his opinions were pretty fully elicited. It is said, that he and his associates were enlarged upon some promise of considering attentively the arguments which might be urged upon them, in a conference with certain divines appointed for that purpose[1]. But if they had any such indulgence, it might seem to have been imperfect and conditional[2]. At all events, he and his party never slackened. Pamphlets kept-up their own strength, and the irritation of their opponents[3]. An offensive inscription upon the coffin of a Barrowist, who died in prison, ran like wildfire through London[4]. The party was computed at near twenty thousand[1], and neither Churchmen nor Disciplinarians could be blind to the prospect of its daily extension. Both were willing, accordingly, to seek its repression by an act of legal violence.

---

[1] Paule's *Whitgift*. 58. Examinations of Henry Barrowe, &c. *ut supra*. 330.

[2] Nov. 19, 1586.

---

[1] HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 323.

[2] In a memorial to the council, placed under 1592, Barrow and Greenwood are said to have been "now more than five years in prison, yea four of these five years in close prison, with miserable usage." Greenwood, however, appears from this memorial, to have been apprehended within a month "at an honest citizen's house upon Ludgate-hill," at two o'clock in the morning, and carried off to Wood-street counter. Perhaps the house on Ludgate-hill might be in the rules of the Fleet. By a former memorial to Burghley, it appears that both Barrow and Greenwood were prisoners in the Fleet. If they had the rules, it will account for their alleged liberty.—STRYPE. *Annals.* LXI. LXII. iv. 129. 134.

[3] One of these remarkably shews the altering aspect of religious party. Giffard, a Puritanical minister, published a pamphlet imputing Donatism to the Barrowists. "Barrow's answer was printed *anno* 1591, while he was a prisoner, which he called, *A plain Refutation of Mr. G. Giffard's reproachful Book, &c. Wherein is discovered the Forgery of the whole Ministry, the Confusion, false Worship, and Antichristian Disorder, of these Parish-Assemblies, called the Church of England. Here also is prefixed a Sum of the Causes of our Separation, and of our Purposes in Practice.* In his Preface to the Reader, he sheweth the four principal transgressions (as he calls them) wherewith he and his party were charged, and for which they forsook the *parish-assemblies;* namely, 1. The profaneness, wickedness, and confusion of the people which were there received, retained, and nourished as members. 2. The unlawfulness of their whole ministry, which was imposed upon them, retained, and maintained by them. 3. The superstition and idolatry of their public worship, in their devised liturgy, which was imposed upon them. 4. And the forgery of their antichristian ecclesiastical government, to which all their churches stand subject. Which transgressions were such and so apparent, as not only to prove these parish-assemblies not to be true established churches of Christ, but, &c., and sufficient causes of separation from them in this degenerate estate."—STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 191.

[4] "This is the corps of Roger

The lawyers of that day were never at a loss to render effectual, any craving of powerful cruelty[2]. A statute had been passed, several years before, making the writing or dissemination of seditious pieces, a capital felony[3]. Under the odious principle of straining acts constructively, legal subtlety very soon brought two unhappy Brownists to an untimely end[4]. They had spread controversial attacks upon the liturgy: this was tantamount to libelling the queen, through her ecclesias-

---

Rippon, a servant of Christ, and her Majesty's faithful subject. Who is the last of sixteen or seventeen, which that great enemy of God, the archbishop of Canterbury, with his high commissioners, have murdered in Newgate within these five years, manifestly for the testimony of Jesus Christ. His soul is now with the Lord: and his blood crieth for speedy vengeance against that great enemy of the saints, and against Mr. Richard Young (a justice of the peace in London). Who in this, and many like points, hath abused his power, for the upholding of the Romish Antichrist, prelacy, and priesthood."—STRYPE. *Annals.* iv. xc. p. 186. *sub an.* 1592.

[1] Sir Walter Raleigh in the House of Commons, Ap. 4, 1593. —D'EWES. 517.

[2] "This was according to the invariable practice of Tudor times: an oppressive and sanguinary statute was first made, and next, as occasion might serve, a construction was put on it contrary to all common sense, in order to take away men's lives." — HALLAM. *Const. Hist.* i. 290. note.

[3] 23 Eliz. ch. 2.

[4] "Elias Thacker was hanged at St. Edmondsbury, in Suffolke, on the fourth of June, and John Coping, on the sixt of the same month, for spreading certaine bookes, seditiously penned by one Robert Browne, against the booke of Common Prayer, established by the lawes of this realm. Their bookes, so many as could be found, were burnt before them." (STOWE. 696. *sub an.* 1583.) "It appears by the judges' letter, that it was for their denial of the Queen's supremacy in all causes: which they allowed only in *civil.* And this chiefly the judges thought fit to take hold of in the book."—STRYPE. *Annals.* iii. 270.

tical supremacy. The same inhuman sophistry was again put into requisition against Barrow, Greenwood, and three others. Being tried at the Old Bailey[1], as publishers of sedition, they were necessarily convicted by a jury led to believe that such tracts as theirs were virtually seditious. This conviction, it was hoped, would overcome their obstinacy, especially as it was coupled with appearances of immediate execution. During their previous confinement, Cartwright had conferred with Barrow, who declared himself to have done nothing more than push his premises to their legitimate conclusions. The archbishop would have had a second conference between the admitted master and his over-active pupil, but Cartwright refused consent. The miserable convicts being now under daily expectation of a violent death, several dignitaries in the church were sent to reason with them. Barrow told them that, although mistaken, they were not the persons whom he most disliked. In their case, principle went hand in hand with practice, and they walked according to the light that God had given them. But he complained of Cartwright and his friends, for teaching that established ordination was antichristian, and then deserting those who fairly carried-out that position. Being reminded of the Marian martyrs, he did not deny their services to religion, but raising his own manacled hands, he added, "These holy bands of mine are much more glorious than any of theirs, because they bore the mark of Antichrist[2]." Farther argument being evidently hopeless, the unfortunate prisoners were paraded to Tyburn, with all the horrid formalities of approaching execution. While awaiting the stroke of death, a reprieve came, and sent them back to Newgate[1]. Being found wholly proof even against this barbarous attempt at intimidation, within a week, the felon's death was really inflicted upon Barrow and Greenwood[2]. They met it with all the firmness that must have been anticipated; and they were careful to wipe away the imputation of unquestionable sedition, by dying with ardent loyalty upon their lips. The queen could hardly have heard of this without compunction, and she is said to have expressed regret at having consented to their execution[3]. Of their brother-convicts, one was banished, the other two died in prison.

---

[1] Mar. 21, 1593.

[2] PAULE'S *Whitgift*. 68. HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 324.

While this cruel spectacle was fresh in the public mind, John Penry, another noted Barrowist, was apprehended. He was born in Brecknockshire, and had studied in both universities[4]. Having conceived an uncontrollable antipathy to the established clergy, he seems never to have regularly taken orders[5]. He preached, nevertheless, among his countrymen, in Wales; for whose religious welfare he always expressed a most affectionate concern, and who first, he said, received the Gospel from him[1]. Having considerable liveliness of talent, but with a debasing alloy of low, headstrong violence, he took a principal share in preparing the Mar-Prelate tracts. Indeed, he was commonly identified with that scurrilous buffoon himself[2]. This occasioned a search for him, and, like many other discontented religionists, he took refuge in Scotland. However he might differ there upon disciplinarian questions, his hatred of Popery and Prelacy was intense enough to answer every expectation of the country. Hence he received a call, as the phrase goes, and was regularly admitted a public preacher, but undertook no particular cure[3]. He was, indeed, unwilling to fix himself anywhere out of Wales, which he was earnestly bent upon bringing over to his own opinions. This anxiety made him even encourage Hacket's insane explosion, and looking upon it as the first step in that reformation which he certainly predicted, he immediately travelled southward[4]. His anticipations being checked by that unhappy lunatic's execution, he returned precipitately to his old quarters in Edinburgh. When the present parliament met, he ventured upon a journey to London, and concealed himself at Stepney. The vicar of that parish has the unenviable notoriety of betraying him[5]. It should, however, be observed in that clergyman's extenuation, that he did not drag Penry from any close, inoffensive seclusion. The zealous Welshman could emerge from his obscure lodging, and pour the streams of a mind unquestionably eloquent, into the excited ears of a congregation, stealthily awaiting him, in a wood, or other such favourable recess[1]. Nor had his conduct ever given promise of topics purely spiritual. He and his friends were strenuous advocates for that religious polity now known as the *Voluntary System*. Unlike the Disciplinarian party, which maintained the inviolability of property once assigned to sacred uses, and therefore would have reclaimed the impropriations, and all other fixed possessions, formerly monastic, Barrowism threatened confiscation even to parochial endowments. Penry argued against all ecclesiastical estates, both as limbs of Antichrist, and also as pernicious baits. They not only kept alive the hopes of resident Romanists, but likewise allured Jesuits and seminary priests from abroad by seductive speculations upon appropriating them, under some favourable change in politics[2]. There is undoubtedly justice in such views. Domestic Romanism, seeing the secular clergy and its endowments, yet remaining, must have built upon some revolution to bring both into their former channel. However prepared for martyrdom, a Romish emissary could not leave out of his calculations, the chance of a comfortable benefice instead, on sailing for his native land. But a preacher who made of such accidental disadvantages, a reason for decrying endowments altogether, would speak here to the mere passions of his auditory. His voice would really be greeted by cupidity, pride, and envy. This is quickly discerned by parties whom such doctrine tends to degrade and beggar. Some allowance, therefore, is fairly due for their natural dislike and irritation. Penry, besides, maintained opinions highly obnoxious to both the great Protestant parties, and marked-out, accordingly, by the general voice for suppression, whatever difficulty or obloquy might attend it.

---

[1] March 31. Their necks were actually placed in the nooses.—Stowe. 765.

[2] April 6.—*Ibid.*

[3] "When Dr. Reynolds, who attended them, reported their behaviour to her Majesty, she repented that she had yielded to their death."—Neal. i. 479.

[4] "Educated first at Cambridge, afterwards in St. Alban's Hall, Oxford, where he proceeded M.A. 1586."—Neal. i. 480.

[5] Neal states him to have "entered into holy orders." In a dissenting work this, undoubtedly, may not mean, that he had been episcopally ordained. In his indictments, however, he is described *clericus.* But when examined before Fanshaw and Young, April 10, 1593, he was asked, "What calling have you to preach? Were you never made minister according to the order of this land?" His answer was, "I might if I had been willing, have been made either deacon, or priest; but I thank the Lord, I ever disliked these Popish orders; and if I had taken them, I would utterly refuse them, and not stand by them, at any hand." (*Harl. Misc.* iv. 343.) This, in spite of the indictments, appears conclusive against episcopal ordination.

---

[1] NEAL. *ut supra.*

[2] From the examinations of divers persons, about the printing of Mar-Prelate, taken at Lambeth, Feb. 15, 1589, it is evident that Penry was particularly active in the printing of this libellous miscellany, and he seems to have been considered on all hands, as the principal author.—STRYPE. *Annals.* iii. Append. LXVIII. p. 602.

[3] "I have taught publicly in the Church of Scotland, being thereunto desired earnestly, and called by the order of that Church. Charge I never had any, therefore, I never bare office either there, or in any other Church."—Examinations, &c. *Harl. Misc.* iv. 343.

[4] HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 325.

[5] *Ibid.*

---

[1] "*Fanshaw*. And what office had you in your church, which meet in woods, and I know not where? *Penry*. I have no office in that poor congregation: and as for our meetings either in woods, or anywhere else, we have the example of our Saviour Christ, of his Church, and servants in all ages, for our warrant."—Examinations, &c. *ut supra*. 342.

[2] "The traitorous Jesuits and Seminary priests, hoping to possess these execrable livings and offices again, are also thereby allured readily to become most unnatural traitors, against their natural prince and country; and the Papists at home are by this means kept still in remembrance of that Romish Egypt, and in continual expectation of their long-desired day: whereas if these offices and livings were once removed, the devised works and callings would fall with them, the Pope and his traffickers would be utterly void of all hope to set-up the standard of the Man of Sin again in this noble kingdom, here being not so much as an office, or one penny of maintenance left for any of his members, the Jesuits and Priests would have no allurements to make them rebells against their prince, and the seduced Papists at home

Being examined, on his apprehension, by two lay magistrates, Penry admitted himself an enemy to existing ecclesiastical offices, the qualifications required for them, much of their business, and the endowments maintaining them. He stigmatized all such offices as *false*, the creatures of Antichrist, and inferred the necessity of separation, because every degree of conformity was a submission to the yoke of antichristian bondage. Of the Marian martyrs, he expressed a deference for no one but Latimer. In fact, he seems to have considered Wickliffe as his master, and to have chiefly venerated the martyred Lollards, with such Protestants as had been

---

would easily forget their idolatry, there being here neither office, nor any other monument of that antichristian religion left to put them in mind of that Babel."—Examinations, &c. *ut supra*. 347.

burnt in Henry's time, after the rupture with Rome. As usual, he disclaimed all political intentions, and finely said, "I am assured, if her Majesty knew the equity and uprightness of our cause, we should not receive the hard measure which we now sustain. We and our cause are never brought before her, but in the odious weeds of sedition, rebellion, schism, or heresy. It is no marvel, therefore, to see the edge of her sword turned against us[1]."

As a political offender, however, preparations were made for trying him. The first intention was to indict him upon certain passages in his published works, but means were supplied him for shewing the illegality of this course[2]. Two indictments were then framed against him, unfairly founded on his own private papers[3]. Among these were discovered an unpresented address, or petition to the queen, and sundry remarks upon England. Both were penned in Edinburgh, and the latter were described by the prisoner as little else than observations that he had heard in Scotland, made by persons acquainted but slightly with English affairs[4]. Both papers are intemperate and offensive, not creditable to the possession of any man, favourable to their general purport, much less to his handwriting. Still, it was an intolerable oppression to ground a charge of felony upon unpublished *memoranda*. The times, however, were not sufficiently spirited and discerning to foil such an attempt. Hence the miserable prisoner was convicted[1], and within four days was hurried, with barbarous abruptness, to die the felon's death[2]. He was only thirty-four, and he left a widow, with four young children[3]. He was evidently a man of genius, but he wanted moderation, and he lived when power disdained forbearance.

---

[1] Examinations, &c. *ut supra.* 341. 345.

[2] These he embodied in a declaration, dated May 16, 1593. The particulars, evidently drawn-up by a lawyer, are printed in Strype. (*Whitgift.* ii. 181.) He there identifies his principles with Lollardy, and argues, that the statute of 23 Eliz. (neither having revived ancient statutes against Lollardy, nor abrogated that of 1 Edw. VI. which repealed them,) could not apply to him. He also urges many other points.

[3] Both indictments are printed in Collier (ii. 639). They are framed to bring the prisoner under the statute 23 Eliz. ch. 2, *against seditious words and rumours uttered against the Queen.*

[4] Penry's Protestation before his death. (Strype. *Whitgift.* Appendix XVIII. iii. 306.) Mr. Hallam truly says of this, that it "is in a style of the most affecting and simple eloquence. It is a striking contrast to the coarse abuse for which he suffered."—*Const. Hist.* i. 278. note.

Although Barrowism did not propose to involve all

---

[1] May 25, at Westminster, before Sir John Popham, lord chief justice, and the other judges of the Court of Queen's Bench.

[2] "Executed at St. Thomas of Waterings, near London, on the 29th of the same" (month) "in the year of our Lord, 1593. He was not brought to execution the next second or third day, as most men expected, but when he did least look for it, he was taken while he was at dinner, carried in a close manner to his execution, and hastily bereaved of his life, without being suffered, (though he much desired) to make a declaration of his faith towards God, or his allegiance to the Queen." (Preface to Penry's *History of Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, applied to the Prelacy and Ministry of the Church of England*, published after his death, *apud* HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 326.) Penry appears, from Stowe, to have been confined in the King's Bench prison. This will, probably, account for the place of his execution.

[3] Penry's Protestation, *ut supra.* 312. "As in the case of Barrow and Greenwood, his only crime was disaffection to the hierarchy. This was his unpardonable sin, for which the archbishop would admit no other expiation than the shedding of his blood." (PRICE. *Hist. Nonconf.* i. 416.) Neal says nothing of this kind about Penry, only that the archbishop was "the first man who signed the warrant for his execution." (Statutable precedence will account for this.) But he says of Barrow and Greenwood: "Thus fell these two unhappy gentlemen, a sacrifice to the resentments of an angry prelate." (*Hist. Pur.* i. 479.) This charge is only supported by a violent letter from Barrow, in prison, which seems to have been intercepted. (STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 189.) Such reflections upon the memory of a prelate, highly respected by a large portion of his contemporaries, require more substantial evidence.

England in the meshes of one domineering, intolerant confederacy, it intended an eldership for every particular congregation[1]. The very key-stone of its principles was an unlimited abhorrence of everything Romish. Greenwood thanked God that he was not an Anabaptist[2]. Penry would admit no hope of salvation to such religionists as now call themselves Unitarians[3]. It is easy to see that a party with such opinions offered no prospect of unrestricted toleration. Its ascendancy must have exposed others to persecution. Every religious body aimed, indeed, at undivided occupancy: and this common error may excuse the government in seeking legal protection against sectarian intolerance. It is the manner and measure of its precautions that are indefensible.

Among the memorable religious occurrences of this time, was the conversion, or apostasy, of Henry de Bourbon, who had now filled, nearly four years, the throne of France, under the honoured designation of Henry IV.[4] During this whole period, he necessarily found his difficulties greatly enhanced by the profession of a faith odious to an overwhelming majority of his people. By himself, however, an invincible attachment to it could hardly have been felt at any time. The Bartholomew massacre easily made him turn his back upon a Protestant education, and profess Romanism[1]. He was not, indeed, long in reverting to his original profession[2]. But political expediency would sufficiently account for this. Hugonot and Romanist were the adverse party names which sought popularity for the rival houses of Bourbon and Lorraine. Henry soon found himself unable to receive divinity from the Vatican, without surrendering a most important advantage for the maintenance of a difficult position. But when the assassination of Henry III.[3] extinguished the line of Valois, and opened its hereditary throne to that of Bourbon, the new king was required by interest, no less than duty, to sink, as much as possible, the character of a party-leader. For escaping from Hugonot partisanship, he was not only prepared by a previous desertion, but also by the enervating pressure of a licentious life. His great and amiable qualities were grievously and shamefully alloyed by sensual facility. Experience proves that such men are little to be depended upon when assailed by the sterner calls of duty. Having avoided, accordingly, an appearance of discreditable precipitancy, and found Hugonot principles all but irreconcileable with a Romish throne, Henry announced himself ready for *instruction*[1]. This meant, of course, that he had made up his mind to conform, and was prepared to act his part in a farce, needful to save appearances. The piece having been duly performed, he solemnly renounced a faith exclusively Scriptural[2]. His friend Sully represents him as having come to a conclusion that of the two religions, Romanism was the more certain[3]. Nor can it be denied, that the Calvinistic system which Henry had professed, is liable to be shaken by serious objections, when pressed by sagacious and learned adversaries. It soon begins to labour under its neglect of antiquity, and its wild appeals to private judgment. Still, Henry's apostasy, or conversion, as it is differently called by the two great parties that divide religious Europe, was no glorious triumph to the Church of Rome. His interest was too glaring, and too prominently alleged[4], his morals were too irregular, and his conviction, after all, was too uncertain[5]. His defection, however, gave serious offence and uneasiness to the great body of European Protestants, and Elizabeth castigated it by a letter, which the royal changeling must have read with considerable pain[1].

---

[1] "*Barrow*. The holy government of Christ belongeth not to the profane, or unbelieving: neither can it, without manifest sacrilege, be set over those parishes, as they now stand in confusion, no difference made betwixt the faithful and unbelieving, all being indifferently received into the body of the Church; but over every particular congregation of Christ, there ought to be an eldership, and every such congregation ought to their uttermost power to endeavour thereunto."—Examinations, &c. *Harl. Misc.* iv. 334.

[2] *Ibid.* 339.

[3] "I am free from denying any Church of Christ to be in this land: for I know the doctrine touching the Holy Trinity, the natures and offices of the Lord Jesus, free justification by him, both the sacraments, *&c.* published by her Majesty's authority, and commanded by her laws, to be the Lord's blessed and undoubted truths, without the knowledge and profession whereof no salvation is to be had."—*Ibid.* 341.

[4] He acceded August 2, 1589.

---

[1] Being arrested after the massacre, and threatened by Charles IX. unless he would change his religion, he "evinced little firmness, and readily temporized." He soon appeared at mass, and early in the following autumn, he wrote to the Pope, deploring his former blindness.—SMEDLEY. *Reformed Religion in France.* ii. 41. 44.

[2] Early in 1576.—*Ibid.* 134.

[3] By James Clement, a Dominican friar of 23, libertine in habits, and wrought-up into a fanatical phrensy, by the papal excommunication hurled against Henry III. for his politic disregard of Romish interests. He struck the fatal blow, August 1, 1589.—*Ibid.* 277.

---

[1] May 18, 1593. He was *instructed* at Mantes, from six till eleven in the morning, on the 23d of the following July.—SMEDLEY. *Reformed Religion in France.* 346. 357.

[2] At St. Denis, July 25.—*Ibid.* 359.

[3] *Ibid.* 364.

[4] He said to Wilkes, sent over from England to expostulate, when his change was imminent: "As soon as I was made king of France, I took an oath to learn the principles of the Romish religion, within a certain time; and this was the very condition of my being admitted to the crown. I have deferred this exercise these four years, and was at last brought to it with some reluctancy." (CAMBDEN. 573.) He proceeded with allegations, not to be gainsaid, of his political difficulties, including the slightness of Hugonot support. Of conviction, he said nothing, but he concluded with a very fair plea, of having intentionally forborne to require Protestant services, while he was listening to Romish arguments. As these latter were to triumph, it was worthy of Henry's brighter side, to excuse the party singled-out for defeat, from the humiliation of an unavailing struggle.

[5] "Henry IV. in a jovial humour, told a Scotch marquis, that there were three things, inscrutable to intelligence: 1. Whether Maurice, then Prince of Orange, was valiant in his person? 2.

What religion he himself was of? 3. Whether Queen Elizabeth was a maid or no? (OSBORNE. p. 75.) The just inference from this remark is, that notwithstanding all the prying of ambassadors and courtiers, and of inveterate enemies; and notwithstanding all their long-circulated slanders, not *one single fact* had been detected to convict her of unchastity; otherwise that point never could have been such a mystery as, to his dishonour, his own religion was, to this too voluptuous and worldly, though clever, and active-minded king." (TURNER'S *Eliz.* 588. note.)

Dr. Lingard thus moderately declines to take any credit for his church, from Henry's final adoption of it:—"When he ascended the throne, he had given his word that he would study the grounds of the ancient faith. To the reformed ministers this promise proved a source of alarm and scandal: it was ridiculed by the courtiers, and was considered by the English queen as a mere evasion. But experience convinced Henry that he must redeem his pledge, if he meant to reign in tranquillity." (*Hist. Engl.* viii. 382.)

Look at Henry IV., not as a selfish candidate for personal splendour, but as a man accountable to eternity and posterity, and his position appears truly pitiable. One far less envied by the world might have placed him below temptations to religious inconstancy and immoral habits. A serious mind may fairly doubt, whether his unhappy fall under such temptations did not earn a premature death for himself, and much of the misery that has overtaken his race.

[1] Mr. Turner, (*Elizabeth.* 530. note.) has printed this letter from an original in the British Museum. It may be thus translated:

"Ah! what griefs! Oh, what regret! Oh! how heartfelt was the groan that Morley's news occasioned me! My God! Has, then, the world any power to overwhelm an awful sense of heavenly threatenings? Does, however, even reason promise any good result from an act of such iniquity? Can that gracious Hand, ever hitherto a certain refuge, be thought likely now to fail in your hour of greatest need? Oh! it is a dangerous thing to do evil that good may come of it. Yet, I hope that something may inspire you with a healthier train of thought. Meanwhile you shall constantly stand foremost in my prayers, lest Esau's hands mar Jacob's blessing. The deep friendship and fidelity that you promise, I confess myself to have dearly earned. But you are sincerely welcome, so long as we own a common father. If you seek another, I become but half your sister. Nature you discard. I prefer it greatly to adoption. God knows it is the better. May He give a sounder discretion, and keep your footsteps where duty marks the way.

"Your sister, if the ancient mode

The queen had now lived several years free from the personal alarms that so long disquieted her. But Romish hostility neither slumbered, nor wholly laid aside projects of assassination. Latterly the more furious papal partisans had been modifying their senseless plans. Philip's daughter, Isabella, was now their favourite candidate for the English throne. James of Scotland seemed likely to prove a confirmed Protestant, and his hereditary right was, therefore, unceremoniously dismissed. The *Infanta* had only heard of Protestantism as a monstrous heresy, hatched almost within memory, and little or nothing better than downright infidelity. Hence her claims to Romish confidence were unquestionable, and Persons canvassed for subscriptions to them among English students in the Spanish seminaries[1]. Under the name of Doleman, he also published a pamphlet, advocating so safe a title to the crown. In this, her descent was absurdly traced from various English monarchs, whose places in the genealogical tree would not really bear examination. Henry III. and John of Ghent were, indeed, accurately numbered among her ancestors, though she was very far from representing the hereditary rights of either[2]. But

---

be not abandoned: with the new, I have no concern. E. R. Nov. 12, 1593."

[1] *A Reply to a notorious Libell, intituled a briefe Apologie or Defence of the Ecclesiasticall Hierarchie.* 81. 323.

[2] "Yet all this was excused not long after, when K. James was proclaimed King of England by the general votes of the people, by Parsons, in a letter to a friend of his, as not having proceeded from any design to hinder King James's title, but from an eager desire to gain him over to the Romish religion; and he hoped he should be easily excused, since these methods had proved no real prejudice to the King's claim, *i. e.* in effect, because the success was not answerable to the villainy of his intention." (CAMBDEN. 577.) The piece was entitled *A Conference about the next Succession to the Crown of England, had in* 1593, *by R. Doleman.* "This work, the production of different pens, was revised and edited by Persons."—LINGARD. viii. 405.

English exiles in the pay of Spain, and a few doting bigots whom they influenced at home, could see no difficulty here. Priority of claim would be gained at once by uncompromising subserviency to Rome, and Spanish power to back it.

To the desperate party that indulged in these unpatriotic, senseless visions, Elizabeth's age and healthy constitution were serious mortifications. Even should Isabella succeed, it might not be soon enough to serve her existing friends. Their leaders now had hopes of relief under this dispiriting suspicion. Anthony, claimant of the Portuguese throne, had found refuge in England, after his unsuccessful struggle with Philip. He was yet surrounded by a few of his countrymen, to whom were conceded unusual facilities of intercourse with the Peninsula, in hope of service to their master's cause[1]. This, however, appearing ruined irretrievably, they became weary of an interminable connection with dethronement and poverty. Their present views were towards reconciliation with the Spanish government, and a return home as its loyal subjects[2]. From such men might reasonably be expected any peace-offering, within reach, and likely to prove acceptable. The most considerable person among them was Stephen Fereira dà Gama, whose adherence to Anthony's cause had been punished by the forfeiture of an ample estate in his own country[3]. He lodged in London, with Roderic Lopez, a Portuguese, long settled in England, and possessed of an empirical celebrity, which had made him a sworn physician to the royal household, although his real knowledge of medicine was by no means unquestioned[1]. Professedly, the doctor was a Christian, but he really seems to have been a Jew, not only by birth, but also in belief. At first, he had hopes of some enormous gain from Anthony, by pressing his suits upon the queen, in the course of his own attendance upon her. But he had long seen the vanity of any promises from such a quarter, and he now thought only of using the Portuguese as a channel for transmitting projects of poisoning Elizabeth, into Spain. Anthony had pledged himself to fifty thousand crowns, and he now asked as much. His flagitious overtures meeting with some favourable reception, a regular communication was opened with the Count de Fuentes, Spanish minister, at Brussells, and Stephen Ibarra, war secretary in the Low Countries[2]. The plot having thus gotten into train, Anthony Perez, formerly secretary to Philip, now living disgraced in England, gained some knowledge of it[3]. Restoration to his old master's favour was unquestionably hopeless. But he might have revenge by making him infamous, and secure for himself in exile, a degree of attention, which had hitherto been denied. He awakened, accordingly, some apprehension of mischief from the expatriated Portuguese, in Robert Devereux, earl of Essex, eventually so unfortunate[1]. By the queen's desire, Essex, with Burghley, and Robert Cecil, his younger son, afterwards earl of Salisbury, went to the house of Lopez[2]. Little or nothing was discovered[3], but notwithstanding, the searchers had no reason to believe themselves misled. Hence, when Essex left town for Windsor, he took Fereira, and left him, in a sort of honourable custody, at Eton College, where the dethroned king of Portugal was provided with lodgings. Orders were now given for transmission to court of all letters directed from abroad to any Portuguese. A communication soon arrived with sufficient evidence to criminate Fereira, another of his nation, and Lopez besides[4]. Confessions, perhaps, extorted on the rack, or from fear of it, explained and confirmed what mysterious letters hinted, or private information revealed. The three were, accordingly, tried at Guildhall, for high treason, and convicted[5]. Their lives were spared during three months, in the fruitless hope of new discoveries. They were then executed at Tyburn, with more than usual barbarity, consciousness being so little destroyed by their brief suspension, that men were actually obliged to hold them down, while the butchery proceeded which traitors were to undergo[1]. On the day after their condemnation, Patrick Cullen, an Irish fencing-master, lately from the Netherlands, was convicted of treason. He appears to have been sent over as a sort of agent, by the disaffected English on the continent, and some of his admissions were deemed conclusive of designs upon the queen's life. He, too, was executed, although so ill as to render a natural death little likely to be long delayed[2]. Two others also, named Yorke and Williams, were apprehended as agents in the nefarious plots of assassination patronised by Fuentes, and conducted by Ibarra[3]. They seem, at least, to have been concerned in some scheme for firing the navy[4]. This whole mass of treachery brought new obloquy upon Romanism[5], although undoubtedly, it

---

[1] Bacon. *A True Report of the Detestable Treason intended by Doctor Roger Lopez.* Works. iii. 109.

[2] Bishop Carleton's *Thankful Remembrance.* 151.

[3] Bacon. *ut supra.*

---

[1] BACON. *ut supra.*

[2] Obscure intercepted letters from both are printed by Carleton.—*Thankful Remembrance.* 161, 162.

[3] LINGARD. viii. 386. Bishop Carleton does not mention the informant, but merely that the queen "was given to understand" Fereira's intention of going to the king of Spain, accompanied by "the eldest sonne of the King Antonio, and diverse other Portugals, servants and followers of the said King, to offer their service to the King of Spaine, and to seeke their peace with him." (*Thankf. Rem.* 152.) Perez "was fled for some commotions he had raised in Aragon, and absconded at this time in England." (CAMBDEN. 578.) "He was a statesman of parts and address, but vain and imprudent, deceitful and vindictive. As the possessor of important secrets, he probably expected a gracious reception from Elizabeth: but the Queen refused him an audience; even Burleigh admitted him but once into his company; Essex alone listened to his suggestions, and took him under protection." (LINGARD. *ubi supra.*) The queen "declared he was sent over without her knowledge, by the French King to his ambassador, and that she neither would relieve, nor protect him. Indeed, she had a perfect aversion to him for betraying his prince's secrets."—CAMBDEN. *ubi supra.*

---

[1] Lingard. *ubi supra.*

[2] Carleton. *ubi supra.*

[3] In Oct. 1593, Essex apprehended Fereira at the house of Lopez. (Carleton. *ubi supra.*) His subsequent search there, with the two Cecils, was Jan. 28, 1594. (Lingard. *ubi supra.*) Lopez "had been made prisoner in 1588, and had since, on account of his skill, been retained in the royal service." (*Ibid.*) "And for the evasion and mask that Lopez had prepared for this treason, if it had not been searched and sifted to the bottom, it was, that he did intend but to cozen the king of Spain, without ill meaning."—Bacon.

[4] Carleton. 153.

[5] Feb. 28. Stowe. 766.

---

[1] Stowe. 766.

[2] Cambden. 577.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] "Letters were certainly intercepted, which proved the existence of a plot to set fire to the fleet." (Lingard. viii. 387.) It was to have been done "with balls prepared for that purpose."—Cambden. *ubi supra.*

[5] "Thus did the English fugitives, lewd priests, and lay villains together, plot and contrive the ruin of the Queen, by all the arts they could use; and all from a pernicious principle of bigotry rooted in their minds, that *Princes excommunicated are not fit to live;* and the Spanish ministers seconded the design, and improved their hatred as far as it would go." (Cambden. *ubi supra.*) Dr. Lingard says of projects to assassinate Elizabeth, "There exist in the archives at Simancas, several notices of such offers." (viii. 384. note.) But his text says, "it is extremely difficult to fix on any one particular instance in which the guilt of the accused appears to have been fairly proved." Persons appears from him to have discouraged these atrocious plans, and in a note to the next page, he adds, "There are among the records at Simancas, several notices sent to Philip of plots to assassinate him. Probably both that prince and Elizabeth attributed to each other projects of which they were equally incapable." The queen shewed herself incapable of such baseness by her late reception of Perez, and by every action of her life. Facts are by no means equally favourable to Philip. Nor, in spite of subtle objections to amount of proof, in particular instances, is it

bore a character more decidedly secular, than most of the discreditable transactions implicating the papal party, under Elizabeth. The pope was never compromised, nor any religious order, nor was there the least appearance of fanaticism in any quarter. Nothing came out but senseless and guilty projects, concocted by unprincipled adventurers for their own selfish ends, and encouraged by a foreigner of secondary distinction, equally to the discredit of his character and capacity.

Romish hostility to the Church not only failed, in every stage, to deaden the concurrent energies of Puritanism, but it was indirectly, though really, seconded by many who professed friendship for the established religion. The bulk of Elizabeth's courtiers, or their immediate predecessors, had founded families, or mended fortunes, from monastic pillage. In some cases, an enormous mass of abiding property had been thus accumulated. No layman could rise to eminence without regretting these palmiest of all days for a royal favourite. It was true that service and sycophancy had already absorbed all the ample revenues which once filled England with noble religious houses. But the seculars, especially those of high degree, had still much to tempt cupidity. Lambeth-house would make an admirable town-residence for Leicester[1], Ely-

---

easy to acquit contemporary Popery of a design to murder the queen, or to acquit Philip of a favourable eye towards such wickedness. Bacon positively denies that he had ever received similar provocation from Elizabeth. "There was never any project by her Majesty, or any of her ministers, either moved, or assented-to for the taking away of the life of the said king: neither hath there been any declaration or writing of estate, no, nor book allowed, wherein his honour hath been touched, or taxed, otherwise than for his ambition, a point which is necessarily interlaced with her Majesty's own justification."—*Observations on a Libel.* Works. iii. 41.

[1] "Leicester cast a covetous eye on Lambeth-house, alledging as good arguments for his obtaining thereof, as ever were urged by

house for Hatton[1]. The hall, or castle, might have another court, or rise a story higher, and be nobly filled, if its owner could but eke his rent-roll by some contiguous ecclesiastical estate. Or he who just began to feel the warmth of royal smiles, but was chilled by penury at home, might himself own a cheerful mansion, and welcome clustering tenants, if he could only plunder any well-endowed preferment. Such hopes were fed by the queen's privilege of making exchanges, as they were called, on avoidances of bishoprics. Thus many a family gained land, or manor, which an ancient prelate, probably, had left to his see, instead of his heirs. But bishops, though often severely impoverished, still retained much that a courtier or statesman was ever longing and scheming to obtain. There were, besides, ecclesiastical estates in every quarter, unconnected with prelacy, hence unaffected by the statute which gave so convenient a hold upon more distinguished portions of religion's patrimony. Every piece of them would, at least, round and improve. To gain any of the spoil, yet so temptingly displayed, it was argued that a great mass

---

Ahab for Naboth's vineyard." (FULLER. *Ch. Hist.* 130. WALTON's *Hooker.* 141.) In the margin, Fuller says alliteratively, "Lambeth-house, Grindal's guilt." Other accounts make Leicester alienated from him in consequence of a sentence that he gave against that powerful favourite's Italian physician. Julius Borgarucci, popularly known as Dr. Julio, a good Latin scholar, and specious person, left his own country, on account of religion, and settled in England. Leicester not only used his medical services, but also, contemporary libels said, his talents for poisoning. He could take people off by his drugs, just as if they died by a flux, or a catarrh, or any other ailment. This is very likely, when he had the disorder as a foundation, but Elizabeth's age saw no occasion for that preliminary. He had married another man's wife, whom, after a tedious suit, he was compelled to dismiss; Grindal being then archbishop, and deciding against him. —STRYPE. *Grindal.* 335.

[1] STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. 533.

of property, once monastic, or otherwise legally granted away from its ancient holders, by the crown, was now retained under titles artfully concealed, because unfit for scrutiny. Let every suspicious case be sifted narrowly, and the crown would have ample means of rewarding its faithful servants. Little to Elizabeth's credit, she seldom was backward in lending herself to the impoverishment of her ecclesiastical subjects. In resisting the demands which would have tampered importantly with the national religion, she generally shewed a firmness that merits the gratitude of posterity. But her views of churchmen stopped short of the obvious truth, that, in all cases, a satisfactory supply can only be secured by an adequate remuneration. Hence she repeatedly gratified the mercenary spirits around her, by granting commissions of concealment[1]. The fortunate speculators, thus armed

---

[1] "When monasteries were dissolved, and the lands thereof, and afterwards colleges, chantries, and fraternities, were all given to the crown, some demeans here and there pertaining thereunto were still privily retained by private persons, or corporations, or churches. This caused the Queen, when she understood it, to grant commissions to some persons to search after these concealments, and to retrieve them to the crown. But it was a world to consider what unjust oppressions of the people and the poor this occasioned by some griping men that were concerned therein: for under the pretence of executing commissions for enquiry to be made for these lands concealed, and without colour of commission, contrary to all right, and to the Queen's meaning and intent, did intermeddle and challenge lands of long time possessed by church-wardens, and such like, upon the charitable gifts of predecessors, to the common benefit of parishes; yea, and certain stocks of money, plate, cattle, and the like. They made pretence to the bells, lead, and other like things, belonging to churches and chapels, used for common prayer. Farther, they attempted to make titles to lands, possessions, plate, and goods, belonging to hospitals, and such like places, used for the maintenance of poor people; with many other such unlawful attempts and extortions." (STRYPE. *Annals*. ii. 310.)

In consequence of loud complaints excited by these extortioners, the queen revoked by *supersedeas*, all the commissions out in February, 1573, but as she then expressed an intention of with means of raising, or repairing a fortune, immediately summoned the clergy of the district surrendered to their gripe, and tortured them by a string of the most inquisitorial enquiries. In many cases, they assumed episcopal powers of investigation, thinking seemingly, that some detected legal or canonical irregularity might, at least, extort a bribe, to console them, on the occurrence of a title vexatiously good[1]. If these concealment-harpies had roamed unimpeded, Barrowism would soon have lost an opportunity of complaining that so many benefices were left for tempting over Jesuits, and Seminary-priests. But the various archbishops were driven from time to time, into pressing such remonstrances as could not wholly be disregarded. Up to this very year, however, the greediness of spoil had outlived every check. A scheme was even afloat for making tangible the entire capitular pro-

---

prosecuting the business by more unexceptionable means, the selfish people about her merely waited for the storm to blow a little over; when fresh commissions were issued. It is fair to observe that a precedent for this iniquity was to be found under Queen Mary, who granted some letters patent of concealment, the first being to Sir George Howard. In the 21st of James I. an act was passed putting an end to commissions of concealment. They were, in fact, a branch in that system of extortion that ran through the whole Tudor administration. Elizabeth did not commission harpies to fly upon the Church alone. Others roamed about the country, at times, under her authority, to look for persons who might be brought under the lash of various penal statutes, and frightened into compositions for their forfeitures.

[1] The articles of enquiry in the diocese of Lincoln, in 1582, may be seen in Strype. (*Annals.* iii. 162.) The bishop, in remonstrating with Burghley, seems to think that the concealment commission extended to benefices, formerly connected with religious houses; but the commissioners summoned all the clergy indiscriminately, beneficed and unbeneficed, by the bailiff of the hundred, without consulting the ordinary. Indeed they assumed, it is truly said, "more than episcopal jurisdiction." (*Ib.* 166.) In consequence of his remonstrances, a *supersedeas* was sent down. Some of these men had even marked-out Hartlebury Castle, chief seat of the bishops of Worcester, for their prey.

perty settled by Henry VIII. upon the cathedrals that he had changed from monasteries, or wholly founded. Some pettifogging pretences were set-up for cavilling at the acts which had confirmed his grants, and thus bringing many thousands a year under the crown's immediate disposal. Had this device gone forward, Elizabeth would have been instantly beset by hosts of hungry claimants for reward, and officious recommenders of ready purchasers. But Whitgift gained information of the nefarious project, seemingly, before confirmed by the great seal, and his indignant representations rendered it abortive[1]. If an excuse were sought for the queen's culpable facility, in granting commissions of concealment, perhaps, no better could be found than her limited means of remunerating services, support, and flattery. The immense revenues of later years have given such appliances to power, in offices, pensions, and commissions, as the sixteenth century would have pronounced altogether incredible. Elizabeth had really, therefore, temptations to answer pressing calls, by such expedients as would be far more infamous in a wealthier age.

This year was distinguished by the appearance of the first four books of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, a work that permanently affected English theology[2]. The erudite and amiable author, born in Exeter, or its suburbs, about 1553, of well-descended, but not wealthy, parentage, received his university education at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, under the kind patronage of Bishop Jewel. After a residence of five years, that excellent prelate recommended him, though no more than nineteen, to Archbishop Sandys, who placed a son under his college-tuition, little younger than himself[1]. Having taken orders, and vacated his fellowship by marriage, he was presented to the rectory of Drayton Beauchamp, in Buckinghamshire[2]. Upon this he resided about twelve months, in considerable discomfort, an infant family, with scanty means, having added to the evils, even now all but inseparable from the first year's possession of a small benefice. Young Sandys, going with a fellow-pupil, George Cranmer, great-nephew to the archbishop, to visit their valued college-tutor, at Drayton, was shocked by his poverty-stricken home, and discontented wife. Hence he begged his father, the archbishop, to make, without needless delay, some better provision for him. Sandys, accordingly, soon after, recommended him to the mastership of the Temple; a situation which Hooker, shy, gentle-tempered, and studious, was far from willing to undertake[3]. It brought

---

[1] Aug. 28, 1594. Four men appear to have put themselves forward as commissioners, upon this occasion. One of them, the archbishop says, "upon the death of the last bishop of Norwich, took upon him to grant out a commission for the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in some part of that diocese, if he had not forbid him."—STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 198.

[2] Only the first four books of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* were published in 1594. The fifth book appeared in 1597. The remaining three were posthumous, and long desiderated. "The results of his" (Hooker's) "publications were great, and presently perceptible: a school of writers immediately sprang-up, who, by express reference, or style, or tone of thought, betray their admiration of Hooker;

Covel, Edwin Sandys, Field, Raleigh, and others; and what was infinitely more important, Hooker had his full share in training-up for the next generation, Laud, Hammond, Sanderson, and a multitude more such divines: to which succession and series, humanly speaking, we owe it that the Anglican Church continues at such a distance from that of Geneva, and so near to primitive truth, and apostolical order." — Preface to KEBLE'S *Hooker*. civ.

[1] WALTON'S *Hooker*. 126.

[2] By John Cheney, Esq. Dec. 9, 1584.—*Ib.* 135.

[3] "His wish was rather to gain a better country living where he might see God's blessing spring out of the earth, and be free from noise (so he expressed the desire of his heart), and eat that bread which he might more properly call his own, in privacy and quietness. But notwithstanding this averseness, he was at last persuaded to accept the bishop's" (Sandys')

him, indeed, into immediate collision with Walter Travers, the learned, able, and courteous lecturer. This eminent man, the main literary prop of his party, was of unblemished morals, but hasty temper. He studied first at Trinity College, Cambridge, then at Geneva[1]. To that famous model of pontifical democracy, he took a thorough fondness for Calvin's principles, and he left it excellently fitted for unfolding them in his *Book of Discipline*, the elaborate Latin volume, which answered every consistorian appeal. In his way home, he received ordination from the presbytery at Antwerp[2]. Being again in England, his established reputation introduced him as domestic chaplain and tutor, into the family of Lord Burghley. Through that statesman, and aided by two letters to the benchers, from Aylmer, bishop of London, Travers was named afternoon preacher at the Temple[3]. In this office his abilities rapidly gained him great attention, and an active party meant him for master on the death of Alvey, a venerable man, highly respected, of his own principles, whose age allowed no prospect of a much longer incumbency. Hooker's promotion was naturally a severe disappointment, which Travers vented, by pronouncing him to have entered upon his charge by virtue only of a

---

"proposal, and was by patent for life, made Master of the Temple, the 17th of March, 1585, he being then in the 34th year of his age."—WALTON'S *Hooker*. 137.

[1] *Ib*. 153. HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 313.

[2] Supplication of Walter Travers. *Hooker's Works*. Lond. 1632. p. 458. Travers defends the legality of his ordination, by the case of Whittingham, who might, he says, have retained his preferment to that time, had he lived: but this Archbishop Whitgift denied. Fuller terms Travers "the neck, allowing Mr. Cartwright for the head, of the Presbyterian party."—*Ch. Hist.* Book ix. p. 136.

[3] HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 313. Travers contended that the bishop of London's recommendatory letters were a sufficient license.—Supplication, *ubi supra*. 459.

human creature[1]:" party *shibboleth*, unworthy of a superior mind, meaning that he was not popularly elected. The master and the lecturer soon found a single church quite unsuited for them both. The former, college-pupil to Reynolds, entertained, indeed, many Calvinistic views, but he would not push them home. One, accordingly, preached a sermon, and the other attacked it upon the next opportunity[2]. Thus Hooker's new preferment became perfectly intolerable. He was not physically tempered for a long pulpit-controversy, and his qualifications to secure popular attention were defective; seemingly, very far below those of his opponent[3]. Under his disquietude he sought aid from Archbishop Whitgift, who silenced Travers, and ultimately removed him, by means of the High Commission Court, as unqualified for ministering in the Church of England, from want of episcopal ordination[4].

---

[1] Hooker's Answer to Travers's Supplication.—*Works*. 470.

[2] "As one pleasantly expressed it, *The forenoon sermon spake Canterbury; and the afternoon, Geneva.*"—Walton. 153.

[3] "His sermons were neither long nor earnest, but uttered with a grave zeal and an humble voice: his eyes always fixed on one place to prevent his imagination from wandering; insomuch that he seemed to study as he spake."—*Ib*. 169.

[4] Strype. *Whitgift*. i. 448. Travers does not seem to have publicly avowed the celebrated Puritanical text-book, *De Disciplina Ecclesiastica*, though sufficiently known as its author. It appeared in an English dress, under the name of the *Directory*, in 1644. He had been repulsed in an application for a fellowship of his college, under the mastership of Dr. Beaumont, "for his intolerable stomach:" but when Whitgift succeeded, he was admitted. The experiment, however, proved very unsatisfactory, continual quarrels arising between the two, and Whitgift rather allows that he drove him from the college, saying that "he was forced by due punishment so to weary him, till he was fain to travel." He seems to have lost his fellowship by refusal to take episcopal orders within the time limited by the statutes. (Abp. Whitgift to Ld. Burghley. *Ib*. 343, 344.) "But so it happened, (and it happened very well for Travers,) that the Queen had erected an university

While entangled in these unhappy polemics, Hooker bent all the energies of an acute, fertile, and scholarly mind, to examine the consistorian discipline, so loudly vaunted as an integral member of the Gospel. He found at once an impregnable ground in the extreme, and suspicious recency, of any notice respecting it. Hence he reasonably concludes that "those who defend it, devised it[1]." To his inquiries into the soundness of its claims upon society, we owe the *Ecclesiastical Polity*[2].

---

at Dublin, in the year foregoing, 1591; founding a college therein dedicated to the Holy Trinity; to the provostship whereof he was invited by the Archbishop of Dublin, who had been once fellow of the same house with him. Glad of which opportunity to go off with credit, he prepares for Ireland. But long he had not dwelt on his new preferment, when either he proved too hot for the place, or the country, by reason of the following wars, grew too hot for him: which brought him back again to England; where he lived to a very great age in a small estate, more comfortably than before, because less troublesome to the Church than he had been formerly."—HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 315.

[1] *Eccl. Pol.* III, Keble's Ed. i. 493.—"The rapid progress of this system, wherever it was introduced at all under favourable circumstances, proved that it touched upon some chord in human nature which answered to it very readily: while the remarkable fact, that not one of the Reformers besides ever elicited the same theory for himself, but that is in all instances traceable to Calvin and Geneva, would seem to be very nearly decisive against its claim to Scriptural authority." (KEBLE. Preface to *Hooker*. liii.) "Neyther for 1540 yeares did ever this foolish conceit come in any men's head that merchantes, men of occupation, musterd-sellers and tinkers, were men sufficient for the government of churches."—SUTCLIFFE. *An Answere to certaine calumnious petitions*, &c. 30.

[2] He finished the first four books on his rectory of Boscombe, near Salisbury, to which he was preferred by Archbishop Whitgift, in 1591, the see of Sarum, which regularly has the patronage, being vacant. This first portion of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* was entered at Stationers' Hall, March 9, 1592, though not published until 1594. Hooker vacated Boscombe, in 1595, for the rectory of Bishop's Bourne, near Canterbury, a valuable benefice, in the archbishop's gift, but in the crown, that turn, by the promotion of Dr. William Redman to the see of Norwich. Whitgift asked it of the queen for Hooker, and at Bourne he died in 1600, being under forty-seven. (WALTON. 163. 173.) That

That illustrious work is, therefore, triumphantly approved by the event, as the fruit of a discerning and practical understanding. What many of Hooker's contemporaries

Hooker was drawn into the composition of his *Ecclesiastical Polity* by the controversy with Travers, as stated by Walton, is incidentally confirmed by a passage (first printed by Mr. Keble) in his Sermon on Pride. "Accordingly, the summer of 1586, may be fixed upon as the time of his commencing the work: and after six years and more, *i. e.* on the 9th of March, 1592-3, the first four books were licensed to *John Windet, dwelling at the signe of the Crosse Keyes, near Powles Wharffe:* most of the work was, therefore, composed in London, amidst the annoyance of controversy, and the interruption of constant preaching to such an audience as the Temple then furnished. —Four days after the entry at Stationers' Hall, the MS. was sent to Lord Burghley, and it is not unlikely that the delay which ensued in the printing was occasioned by him.—The *Editio Princeps* itself is a small folio, very closely, but clearly, and in general, most accurately printed.—That second portion, containing the fifth book alone, came out, as it is well known, in 1597, altogether in the same form as its predecessors. It seems to have excited great and immediate attention." The remaining three books appear to have been completed for publication, at the author's death, but his widow either could, or would give no account of the MS. when sent to by Archbishop Whitgift. Subsequently, before the council, she admitted that many of her husband's papers had been burnt and torn by a person, who seems to have been her son-in-law. "She died suddenly before the examination could be resumed." It became, however, sufficiently plain that Hooker's finished compositions were not likely to be forthcoming, but some draughts were obtained, probably, from Mrs. Hooker, and these came into the possession of Dr. John Spenser, president of Corpus Christi college, Oxford. He might have been entrusted with them by Archbishop Whitgift, as an intimate friend of the author, and a brother-in-law to his pupil, George Cranmer. Spenser republished the five books (a fourth edition,) in 1604, and in the preface, signed J. S., he announces his intention of giving to the world, the three remaining books, "as they are." He was, however, employed in the new translation of the Bible, and at his death, in 1614, the three books remained in MS. In 1648, the sixth and eighth books (or at least what passes for them) were published, endeavours to procure the seventh having failed. Six MSS. are named as used. In 1662, John Gauden, recently translated to the see of Worcester, published a complete edition of Hooker's works, the seventh book appearing for the first time. He does not say where he got the MS. Of these three books, the sixth, though apparently of Hooker's composition, does not really daily pronounced indispensable, and certain of an eventual establishment in England, has long since fallen into universal contempt. Its predicted importance is absolutely hopeless: none think it essential to complete our Lord's institution, very few expedient, or even endurable. But although the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, historically viewed, is a slayer of the slain, its general principles bear importantly upon existing controversies. Hence, independently of its majestic style, diversified learning, sententious acuteness, force and felicity of illustration, it maintains a prominent rank among theological works. It was, in fact, the foundation-stone of a school in Protestant divinity. Hitherto there had been very little exact inquiry into the ground taken by England, at the Reformation. Divines were trammelled by fears of offending foreign Protestants, and of conceding any advantage to Popery[1]. Many of the more active and

---

seem to be the missing book. That ought to discuss lay elders; what we have under its name, discusses little else than Romish views of penance. It has, therefore, been supposed, that some Puritanical examiners of the Hooker MSS. conveyed away the real sixth book, its matter being that in which they felt extraordinary interest, and on which their party felt more acutely than almost any other. (KEBLE. Pref. to *Hooker*. v. vii. ix. xxi. xxvi.) Mr. Keble used for the sixth and eighth books an edition of 1651, and merely cites Wood for an edition in 1648. Wood, however, is correct in naming such edition.

[1] "The feverish and exclusive dread of Romanism, which had for a long time so occupied all men's thoughts as to leave hardly any room for precautions in any other direction, was greatly abated by several intervening events. First, the execution of Queen Mary, though at the cost of a great national crime, had removed the chief hope of the Romanist party in England; and had made it necessary for those, who were pledged at all events to the violent proceedings of that side, to disgust all British feeling by transferring their allegiance to the king of Spain. And when, two years afterwards, his grand effort had been made, and had failed so entirely as to extinguish all present hope of the restoration of Popery in England; it is remarkable how immediately the effect of that failure is discernible in the conduct of the

zealous clergy, besides, read no theology unsanctioned by Geneva. This class necessarily rested all Reformed Churches upon the narrow basis taken there: ostensibly, an exclusive reference to Scripture[1]; really, the concurrent authority of Calvin and Beza, as biblical interpreters[2]. Hooker's key to Scripture was Catholic antiquity[3], an effectual exclusion of ruling elderships, and of all such commentaries as Geneva produced in support of her peculiar system. He argues against a habit of expecting the sacred pages to be as full and precise upon questions of polity, as they are upon articles of faith, contending that human discretion, guided by the consent of primitive times, may allowably regulate ecclesiastical affairs. His arguments maturely weighed, were plainly seen by the majority of Anglican divines, to reveal the very grounds on which their own Reformers had pro-

---

Church controversy with the Puritans. The *Armada* was destroyed in July. In the February following was preached and published the famous sermon of Bancroft at St. Paul's Cross, on the duty of trying the spirits; which sermon has often been complained-of by Puritans and Erastians, as the first express development of high church principles here."—KEBLE. Pref. to *Hooker*. lxv.

[1] "For whereas God hath left sundry kinds of law unto men, and by all these laws, the actions of men are in some sort directed; they hold that one only law, the Scripture, must be the rule to direct in all things, even so far as to the *taking up of a rush or straw*."—HOOKER. *Eccl. Pol.* i. 361.

[2] "Remember to make a comparison between Calvin and Beza, how different they were in naturall disposition, and yeat how linked in amity and concord. Calvin being of a stiff nature, Beza of a pliable, the one stern and severe, the other tractable and gentle. Both wise and discreet men. Whereby we see what it is for any one church or place of government to have two, one succeeding another, both in theire waies excellent, although unlike. For Beza was one whom no one *would* displease, Calvin one whom no man *durst*."—Citation to illustrate Hooker's *Preface*. note. i. 166.

[3] "Although the Scripture be the ground of our belief; yet the authority of man is, if we mark it, the key which openeth the door of entrance into the knowledge of Scripture."—HOOKER. *Eccl. Pol.* i. 404.

ceeded. When these venerated men were upon their inestimable work, Calvin was only rising towards his eventual prominence, and Beza was hardly known. Nor had both achieved their subsequent celebrity, was the English Reformation likely to have been largely affected by them. It was a very cautious movement, which aimed at disturbing nothing clearly connected with primitive times, and paid attention to existing lights only so far as erudition admitted them to be trustworthy. After Hooker published, these facts became generally understood, and men, however cautious, have been encouraged by settled institutions, to avow them. Thus an unlimited licence of private judgment no longer passes for the master principle of the Anglican Reformers. They are known to have been trammelled at every step by scholarly appeals to Christian antiquity. The solidity of their work bears irresistible testimony to the wisdom of its construction.

By Protestant Nonconformity, such appeals have always been, either sparingly made, or altogether disclaimed. In reality, no religious teachers turn the ignorant majority adrift, a translated Bible in hand, and desire each man to make out from it a religion for himself. Individuals and societies, in fact, undertake to be the spiritual guides of those whom they can influence. But many, while performing this necessary duty, are driven to keep it out of sight, or even to profess principles at variance with it. In all cases, a disregard of Catholic antiquity, as to polity, and in some instances, a similar treatment of doctrine, obliges the Dissenter to claim the right of hearing no Scriptural interpreter but himself. Hooker's laborious, acute, and eloquent arguments against such an illusion, being at the head of their class, have never ceased, accordingly, to find notice in Dissenting publications; they all naturally pronounce his inferences unsatisfactory, and even mischievously favourable to Romanism[1]. None undervalue his mastery over the English tongue, the depth and patience of his reasoning powers, the industry with which he collected his information, and the skill with which he used it. He was, indeed, an admirable genius, an acute and indefatigable dialectician, a profound scholar, and a sincere Christian. Every reader rises from his pages as from converse with a most able, amiable, upright, deeply-accomplished man. Time and circumstances gave his immortal work an immediate and enduring prominence, little likely to attend such a mass of laborious argument and profound research. But it is not a book to be disregarded and forgotten, under any disadvantages. The student must have known it as a vast mine of erudition, delightful to work. For general readers, its day, undoubtedly, is gone. Its learned materials are too numerous and too prominent, its train of reasoning is too scholastic, and its whole arrangement

---

[1] "All that human genius, or that the most patient and scrutinising inquiry into the nature of man and the constitution of human society, can effect, is here accomplished on behalf of the hierarchy. If, therefore, such a work fails to sustain its positions; if many of its principles are unsound, and its course of argumentation is precisely similar to that which Popery employs; if large sections of the work are as conclusive against the Protestant faith, as against that form of it to which Hooker was opposed; a strong presumption must be awakened that there was a radical unsoundness in the cause he advocated, which no genius could remedy, or diligence correct." (PRICE. i. 431.) "King James II. it is well known, ascribed to Hooker, more than to any other writer, his own ill-starred conversion to Romanism; against which, nevertheless, if he had thought a little more impartially, he might have perceived that Hooker's works everywhere inculcate that which is the only sufficient antidote, respect for the true Church of the Fathers, as subsidiary to Scripture, and a witness of its true meaning. And the rationalists, on the contrary side, and the liberals of the school of Locke and Hoadley, are never weary of claiming Hooker as the first distinct enunciator of their principles. Whereas, even in respect of civil government, though he might allow their theory of its origin, he pointedly deprecates their conclusion in favour of resistance. And in respect of sacramental grace, and the consequent nature and importance of Church communion, themselves have never dared to claim sanction from him." (KEBLE. Pref. cv.) Hooker's principles, however, are expressly destructive to the Romish system, which depends upon a belief in the existence and necessity of traditions, as authorities for articles of faith. "Such as imagine the general and main drift of the body of sacred scripture not to be so large as it is, nor that God did thereby intend to deliver, as in truth he doth, a full instruction in all things unto salvation necessary, the knowledge whereof man by nature could not otherwise in this life attain unto: they are by this very mean induced either still to look for new revelations from heaven, or else, dangerously to add to the word of God uncertain tradition, that so the doctrine of man's salvation may be complete; which doctrine we constantly hold in all respects, without any such thing added, to be so complete, that we utterly refuse as much as to acquaint ourselves with anything further. Whatsoever to make up the doctrine of man's salvation is added, as in supply of the Scripture's unsufficiency, we reject it. Scripture, purposing this, hath per-

---

fectly and fully done it." (*Eccl. Pol.* i. 420.) Nevertheless, Hooker's patronage of antiquity gave him a hold upon Romanists quite hopeless to Protestants generally of his day. Stapleton, accordingly, eagerly read his first four books at Rome, and spoke of them highly to Clement VIII. The pontiff desired him to read some of them to himself in Latin. This was done to the end of the first book: when Clement said: "There is no learning that this man hath not searcht-into; nothing too hard for his understanding: this man indeed deserves the name of an author; his books will get reverence by age, for there are in them such seeds of eternity, that if the rest be like this, they shall last till the last fire shall consume all learning." (WALTON'S *Life of Hooker*. Keble's Ed. i. 90.)

Thomas Stapleton, who thus introduced a learned countryman to papal notice, was one of the most considerable English scholars of his day favourable to Romanism. He was son to William Stapleton, a gentleman of Henfield, in Sussex, where he was born in the same year and month that ended Sir Thomas More's life: afterwards remarked as an especial providence. He was of the two St. Mary Winton colleges, and took his degree in arts, at Oxford, December 2, 1556. (DODD. ii. 84.) He died at Louvain, in 1598. "He was a most learned assertor of the Romish religion, wanting nothing but a true cause to defend."—FULLER. B. ix. p. 234.

is too diffuse. Learned and reflecting minds will, however, always turn to "judicious Hooker," as to one of the best men and ablest authors that sober-minded, intellectual England has to boast.

CHAPTER VII.

DOCTRINAL PURITANISM.

1595—1604.

RISE OF DOCTRINAL DISAGREEMENT IN THE CHURCH—THE SABBATARIAN CONTROVERSY—THE PREDESTINARIAN CONTROVERSY—THEOLOGICAL MOVEMENTS AT CAMBRIDGE—THE LAMBETH ARTICLES—FARTHER CONTROVERSY AT CAMBRIDGE—THE CALVINISTIC PARTY—CONTROVERSY ABOUT CHRIST'S DESCENT INTO HELL—FANATICAL PRETENSIONS TO MIRACULOUS POWERS—JUDICIAL ATTACK UPON BROWNISM—PARLIAMENTARY ATTACK UPON THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS—ACT FOR THE SECURITY OF DIGNIFIED INCUMBENTS—ARTICULI PRO CLERO—DISAGREEMENTS AMONG THE ROMISH PRISONERS AT WISBEACH—SQUIRE'S TREASON—PAPAL INTERFERENCE WITH IRELAND—PAPAL VIEWS UPON THE ENGLISH SUCCESSION—THE QUEEN'S LAST PARLIAMENT—QUARREL BETWEEN THE ROMISH REGULARS AND SECULARS—PROCLAMATION AGAINST JESUISTS AND THEIR ADHERENTS—PROTESTATION OF THE THIRTEEN ROMISH PRIESTS—CONDEMNED ABROAD—BLACKWELL APPOINTED ARCHPRIEST—DEATH AND CHARACTER OF THE QUEEN—PEACEFUL ACCESSION OF JAMES I.—THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS DISTURBED BY PROHIBITIONS—APPREHENSIONS FROM THE KING'S EDUCATION—THE MILLENARY PETITION—UNEASINESS OF ARCHBISHOP WHITGIFT—UNIVERSITY MOVEMENTS AGAINST PURITANISM—RALEIGH'S CONSPIRACY—THE HAMPTON-COURT CONFERENCE—DEATH AND CHARACTER OF ARCHBISHOP WHITGIFT—CONCLUSION.

ELIZABETH's reign ended, as it began, with a few years of comparative religious peace. Nonconformity, whether Romish or Protestant, had, indeed, lost none of its inherent vigour, or uncompromising pretensions. It remained in perfect readiness to agitate again the whole frame of society, on receiving some fresh impulse. But its fever-fits were over for the present. One cause was, probably, the queen's age. Nature now forbade a lengthened reign, and a succession left open to dispute, allowed each party to build upon a new sovereign with its own opinions.

The next heir, James of Scotland, had been strictly bred under the *Holy Discipline*. Parliament, however, gratified Henry VIII. by powers over the succession that shook public expectations of a descent strictly lineal. Hence even Romish hope was not extinguished. Still, men who expect every year to prove the last of their depression, are little disposed for dangerous efforts. Disciplinarian influence was, also, considerably impaired. The fierce and incessant contentions which Cartwright and others had once aroused, were no longer met at every turn. Many of the more zealous Consistorians were dead, others were cooled by age. A large portion of society, formerly neuter, or in a great measure so, was now decidedly biassed against Presbytery[1]. The reasoning of its opponents had turned the scale. Brown and Barrow had excited a violent prejudice against it, even among Protestants bent upon nonconformity. It is true, that many of the more active and uncompromising Independents had sought a refuge abroad, chiefly in Holland, from domestic persecution[2]. But such emigrants leave a very tenacious influence behind. While their cause was thus upon the decline, the principal Disciplinarians were fast exhausting life. That latent ambition, which is generally at the bottom of man's earlier serious exertions, was become hopeless, favourite speculations no longer appeared infallible, nor opposition to them inexcusable, and most acts were viewed in a light partly reflected from another world. Hence the stirring interest given to Puritanism, during many years, now wanted master-spirits, intent upon maintaining its wonted height.

---

[1] "Now of late years the heat of men towards the Discipline is greatly decayed; their judgments begin to sway on the other side: the learned have weighed it, and found it light: wise men conceive some fear lest it prove, not only not the best kind of government, but the very bane and destruction of all government."—Geo. Cranmer to R. Hooker. Feb. 1598. WALTON'S *Lives*. 187.

[2] "Instead of being proceeded against for sedition, it was resolved to indict them on the statute of the 35th of Elizabeth, which inflicted banishment for non-attendance at church. Mr. Francis Johnson, the pastor of the Brownist church in London, and many of its members, were thus driven into exile. They retired into Holland, where they formed churches on their own model, and published an Apology in vindication of their principles and character."—PRICE. *Hist. Nonconf.* i. 423.

Under this temporary calm, the fire was, however, seeking another vent. Puritanism hitherto had been a mere contest for externals, discipline, and power[1]. In doctrine, the defensive and objecting parties professed a complete identity[2]. But a wide separation upon other questions, occasioned, perhaps imperceptibly, theological discordance. This new feature came distinctly under notice in the contentions between Travers and Hooker. Not only were these two eminent rivals differently ordained, and altogether at variance upon the ministerial commission. Not only did one infer from Scripture, and all antiquity, the necessity of episcopal government, while the other found approval in every record, really venerable, for the pastors and ruling elders of Geneva. Not only was one resolute for continuing public worship as England's glorious martyrs had arranged it, only a few years before; while the other could lend himself to unseemly confusion, rather than conform to anything then overthrown, and now stigmatised as pestilently Popish[1]. The breach daily grew more serious, by irreconcilable declarations upon questions of subtler character. Though Hooker's theology was cast in a Calvinistic mould, yet Travers charged it with a "sour leaven," engendering unsound views. It misrepresented predestination, allowed salvability within the Church of Rome, as a true, but impure and imperfect church, it lowered the assurance of faith[1]. To these leading differences of opinion, others were added less important, and many a controversial sermon was the stimulating fruit. The natural effect of elaborate opposition between two men, so justly celebrated, and publicly put upon their defence, was to surround each by a party with speculative distinctions, no less than disciplinarian. The line of division once boldly drawn, could not remain within the Temple. High Calvinistic principles were soon questioned everywhere. Most approvers of the established ecclesiastical polity agreed with Hooker doctrinally. Nearly all who thought with Travers as to discipline, were equally of his opinion upon doctrine. Nor was this the whole extent of that religious movement which now began to be discernible. The Independents, who reprobated both Episcopalians and Consistorians, espoused universally the doctrinal constructions enforced by Travers, and now urged by opposition into unwonted prominence. Thus the whole body of English Protestant Nonconformists, though split irremediably upon government, became distinguished by certain common principles that kept it under some uniformity of appearance.

---

[1] "Hitherto the controversy between the Church and the Puritans had been chiefly about habits and ceremonies, and church-discipline; but now it began to open upon points of doctrine."—NEAL. i. 495.

[2] "All the Protestant divines in the Church, whether Puritans, or others, seemed of one mind hitherto about the doctrines of faith, but now there arose a party which were first for softening, and then for overthrowing the received opinions about predestination, perseverance, free-will, effectual grace, and the extent of our Saviour's redemption. The Articles of the Church of England were thought by all men hitherto to favour the explication of Calvin; but these divines would make them stand neuter, and leave a latitude for the subscriber to take either side of the question. All the Puritans to a man maintained the Articles of the Church to be Calvinistic, and inconsistent with any other interpretation, and so did far the greatest number of the conforming clergy; but as the new explications of Arminius grew into repute, the Calvinists were reckoned old-fashioned divines, and at length branded with the name of DOCTRINAL PURITANS."—*Ibid.* 497.

---

[1] "Only I require, if any thing be shewed, it may be proved, and not objected only, as this is, *That I have joined myself with such as have always opposed to any good order in the Church, and made themselves to be thought indisposed to the present estate and proceedings.* The words have reference, as it seemeth, unto some such things, as being attempted before my coming to the Temple, went not so effectually, perhaps, forward, as he which devised them would have wished. An order, as I learn, there was tendered, that communicants should neither kneel, as in most places of the realm, nor sit, as in this place the custom is, but walk to the one side of the table, and there standing till they had received, pass afterwards away round about by the other. Which being on a sudden begun to be practised in the church, some sate wondering what it should mean, others deliberating what to do; till such time as at length by name one of them being called openly thereunto, requested that they might do as they had been accustomed, which was granted, and as Master Travers had ministered his way to the rest, so a curate was sent-for to minister to them after their way. Which unprosperous beginning of a thing (saving only for the inconvenience of needless alterations otherwise harmless) did so disgrace that order in their conceit, that it took no place. For neither they could ever induce themselves to think it good, and it so much offended Master Travers, who supposed it to be the best, that he, since that time, although contented himself to receive it as they do at the hands of others, yet hath not thought it meet they should ever receive it out of his, which would not admit that order of receiving it, and therefore, in my time, hath always been present not to minister, but only to be ministered unto."—Master Hooker's Answere to Master Travers his Supplication. *Works.* 471. Keble's Ed. iii. 713.

---

[1] "Whereas he had taught certain things concerning predestination, otherwise than the word of God doth, as it is understood by all Churches professing the Gospel, and not unlike that wherewith Coranus sometimes troubled this Church, I both delivered the truth of such points in a general doctrine, without any touch of him in particular, and conferred also with him privately upon such articles. In which conference, I remember, when I urged the consent of all Churches, and good writers against him, that I knew, and desired, if it were otherwise, what authors he had seen of such doctrine, he answered me, that his best author was his own reason." . . . . "Under colour of answering for himself, he impugned directly and openly to all men's understanding the true doctrine which I had delivered, and added to his former points some other like (as willingly one error followeth another) that is, that the Galatians, joining with faith in Christ, circumcision as necessary to salvation, might not be saved. And that they of the Church of Rome may be saved by such a faith in Christ as they had, with a general repentance of all their errors, notwithstanding their opinion of justification, in part by their works and merits." (Wal. Travers his Supplication. HOOKER'S *Works*. 462. Keble's Ed. iii. 695. 698.) "I have taught, he saith, *That the assurance of things which we believe by the Word, is not so certain as of that we perceive by sense.* And is it as certain? Yea, I taught, as he himself, I trust, will not deny, that the things which God doth promise in his Word, are surer unto us than any things we touch, handle, or see. But are we as sure and certain of them?" (Master Hooker's Answere. *ut supra*. 473. Keble's Ed. iii. 718.) Hooker seems to have heard that Travers talked of his sermons as containing "Absurdities, the like whereunto have not been heard in public places within this land, since Queen Mary's days." (*Ibid.* 478. Keble's Ed. iii. 729.) Coranus, or Anthony de Corro, was a native of Seville, who preached in London to a congregation of Spanish Protestants. He was regularly a member of the Italian church, but gave offence by publishing some opinions, rather at variance with Calvin. The French congregation had already found fault with his treatment of the favourite Genevan theology. He was evidently, however, no complete, or open impugner of it, for he wrote at least seven letters of appeal to Beza, in the winter of 1568, 9. They were most virulent compositions; an ill quality which Beza rebukes, but he would not interfere in the dispute, referring it to Grindal, then bishop of London. Corro was then suspended. Notwithstanding, he was made reader of divinity in the Temple, in 1571, and held that office about three years, very uncomfortably passed. In 1571, he came to Oxford with letters from Leicester. There a charge of Pelagianism was made against him by Reynolds and others, but this

Doctrinal separation had hardly begun, when a new difference arose, which turned out unfortunately for the Church party. It is plain, from existing laws and canons, that considerable strictness prevailed among the Gothic nations, during the earlier ages of their Christian profession, as to the observance of Sunday. This was, however,

---

being over-ruled, he became student of Christchurch, and reader of divinity in some of the halls. He died in London, in 1591. In an abstract of his Lectures on the Romans, published in 1574, he disavows the heresies imputed to him. He was evidently foremost in weakening Calvin's authority over the English theology of Elizabeth's reign.—KEBLE. *Hooker*. iii. 695. STRYPE. *Grindal*. 185. BEZA. Epist. 57, 58, 59.

gradually relaxed, not only, perhaps, from human proneness to elude restraint, but also from the growing multitude of festivals. It became the habit to keep these and Sunday, much in the same way; namely, by a mixture of public worship and mere amusement. The Reformation only acted here by curtailing the number of festivals. Thus, the Lord's Day, or Sunday, as it was indifferently called, was ordinarily devoted, in its earlier portions, to religion; in its latter, to relaxation, or mirth: a system yet adopted on the Continent, equally by Protestants and Romanists. English Puritanism frowned, however, early on all such indulgences; and nine years ago, Saturday and Sunday plays were severely denounced in a *clerum*, at Cambridge[1]. This gave offence, and the matter dropped. But now Dr. Bound published a work, insisting that Sunday was properly a Sabbath-day in the Jewish sense. He argued, that God's command for hallowing a Sabbath, was a moral law, of perpetual obligation, and hence inserted in the Decalogue. Upon this reasonable foundation, he built an inference, that Christianity could go no farther than an alteration of the day, leaving established restrictions upon it exactly where it found them. He condemned, accordingly, existing habits, denying the lawfulness, on Sundays, of application to profane learning, or of receiving a client, or of perusing evidence, or of executing any legal process, or of acting as magistrate, or of ringing more than one bell, or of giving any public entertainment or wedding-dinner, or of entering into any sport, or even of talking upon pleasure, news, or business. This unwonted strictness was not, however, to reach noblemen, and other persons of distinction. They were absurdly and invidiously justified in a continuance of the liberty sanctioned by immemorial usage[1].

---

[1] By John Smith, M.A. His words were, "*Si illud verum sit, quod auditione accepi, istiusmodi certe ludos diris devoveo, et actores et spectatores: si eos metirer pede, arbitrarer certe, vel quod essent dii nati, vel Satanæ futuri. O tempora! O mores! O magistratus!*" Adding further these words, "*That the plays at Saturday and Sunday at night, were breaches of the Christian sabbath. On Sunday, for that they were at it before the sun was set; on Saturday, for disabling of their bodies for the sabbath duties.*" Having mentioned, among other arguments, the Jewish usage of reckoning the sabbath from sunset to sunset, he was questioned before the vice-chancellor, and others, Feb. 26, 1586, whether he held such a mode of reckoning the Christian sabbath to be *jure divino.* He answered negatively; but he maintained that the Lord's-day was to be kept *jure divino* during twenty-four hours, and that works, unnecessary, or unconnected with religion, were generally unlawful within these hours, but he disclaimed any very nice examination of necessity, or any intention to limit the term by Jewish practice. He also disclaimed any intention of dogmatising, and expressed himself ready to treat the matter more satisfactorily, either at the end of that term, or the beginning of next, in another *clerum.* This offensive sermon was delivered on the first day of Lent term. Nothing farther is known about him.—STRYPE. *Annals.* iii. 497.

This palpable inconsistency and partiality proved immaterial to the success of Bound's theory. Saturday had been known, during many centuries, as *the Sabbath*, in documentary and learned language. That designation passed now, at once, with a large party, to Sunday. Some people were naturally disgusted by the new attempts to deprive them of an accustomed holiday, but all the Puritans came into the innovation immediately. The most extravagant sanctity was claimed for Sunday, those who did not keep it according to Bound's ideas, being branded as atrocious offenders[2]. Not only was the less enthusiastic and ascetic temperament of the Church-party revolted by such over-strained rhetoric, but also its opposition was aroused by the general delivery of it from Puritanical pulpits. Sabbatarian rigours were denounced as mere pretences to discountenance the ancient festivals, and thus insidiously make a breach which direct assault had never attempted without a foil[1]. In the mistaken spirit, then prevailing, appeals were urgently made to power, and Bound's book was to be suppressed. Archbishop Whitgift, and Lord Chief Justice Popham, were so ill-advised as to issue orders for its delivery to the bishops and magistracy. Obedience naturally followed in some cases, but it had no other effect than to make the book more scarce, and the people more eager to read it. Soon was it upon clandestine sale for double its

---

[1] FULLER. B. ix. p. 227.

[2] "It being preached at a market-town, as my author tells me, *That to do any servile work, or business, on the Lord's-day, was as great a sin, as to kill a man, or commit adultery:* In Somersetshire, *That to throw a bowl on the Lord's-day, was as great a sin, as to kill a man:* In Norfolk, *That to make a feast, or dress a wedding-dinner, on the*

---

same, was as great a sin, as for a father to take a knife, and cut his child's throat: And in Suffolk, *That to ring more bells than one, on the Lord's-day, was as great a sin, as to commit a murther.*"—Heylin. *Hist. Presb.* 340.

[1] "Some had been hammering on this anvil, ten years before, and had procured the mayor and aldermen of London to present a petition to the queen, for the suppressing of all plays and interludes on the Sabbath-day, (as they pleased to call it,) within the liberties of their city. The gaining of which point made them hope for more, and secretly to retail those speculations which afterwards Bound sold in gross, by publishing his *Treatise of the Sabbath*, which came out this year, 1595. And as this book was published for other reasons, so more particularly, for decrying the yearly festivals, as appears by this passage in the same, viz., *That he seeth not where the Lord hath given any authority to his Church, ordinarily and perpetually to sanctify any day, except that which he hath sanctified himself:* and makes it an especial argument against the goodness of religion in the Church of Rome, That to the seventh day they had joined so many other days, and made them equal with the seventh, if not superior thereunto, as well in the solemnity of divine offices, as restraint from labour. So that we may perceive by this, what their intent was from the very beginning, To cry-down the holidays, as superstitious Popish ordinances, so that their new-found Sabbath being left alone, (and Sabbath now it must be called,) might become more eminent."—*Ibid.*

original price, and its principles daily came to be received as more and more oracular[1]. Vainly did ecclesiastical authorities recommend a continuance of those mirthful habits which had immemorially attended Sunday; they merely gained for themselves the reputation of blind guides and incorrigible worldlings. The more serious people spurned advice to recede from Sabbatarian strictness[2]. Many, more or less, approved of it, who had little or no affection for Puritanism in any shape; and in spite of high-church opposition, a change was wrought in English society, which survives to the present hour. This was an unfortunate point for the commencement of a general doctrinal separation. Whatever objection may be reasonably taken to Bound's principles, and still more to those of some who followed him, there can be no doubt of their soundness in the main. It is of great importance to fix that peculiar character upon Sunday, which is seen in the more serious and rational of English families. Nor could anything have been wiser, on Bound's attainment of notoriety, than such a modification of his views, as would have satisfied all the legitimate calls of Sunday. But such wisdom is very rarely in man. The leading church authorities could see no more than a novel theory propounded and adopted for sinister ends, by their irreconcileable enemies, and supported by all that extravagance which heated spirits always use in advocating startling innovations. Hence they committed themselves, both in this reign and in the next, by injudicious opposition and unseemly expedients. A large portion of their contemporaries felt sure that such people must be reprobates. All posterity blames them for ill-timed interference, and serious minds, however favourable, are driven to admit a degree of faultiness here, even in their principles.

---

[1] FULLER. B. ix. p. 229.

[2] "The more liberty people were offered, the less they used it, refusing to take the freedom authority tendered them. For the vulgar sort have the actions of their superiors in constant jealousy, suspecting each gate of their opening to be a trap, every hole of their digging to be a mine wherein some secret train is covertly conveyed to the blowing-up of the subjects' liberty, which made them almost afraid of the recreations of the Lord's-day allowed them; and seeing it is the greatest pleasure to the mind of man to do what he pleaseth, it was sport for them to refrain from sports, whilst the forbearance was in themselves voluntary, arbitrary, and elective, not imposed upon them."—*Ibid.*

While the Sabbatarian controversy remained in full activity, another arose upon predestination. Ever since the queen's accession, this question, and others connected with it, had rarely attained any very striking prominence. Many of the more eminent clergy having brought from Switzerland and the Rhine, a high veneration for Calvin, his *Institutes* became a standard authority in theology[1]. The more speculative portions passed without particular examination, while religious party was exhausting its intensity, first upon externals of public worship, afterwards upon discipline. But it was natural for those who approved of Calvin's policy, to feel most respect for his divinity. On the other hand, objections to the legislator, could not fail of gradually shaking confidence in the divine. When Disciplinarian principles declined in popularity, this latent feeling found a new subject for the disputatious appetite of man. Materials for the explosion had been recently accumulating fast at Cambridge. The two divinity professors held and taught different opinions upon the stirring questions identified by later times with Calvin's name. William Whitaker, the regius professor, was doctrinally a decided Calvinist. Peter Baron, a learned Frenchmen, more than twenty years Margaret professor, took far lower ground. As these conflicting views appear to have attracted no great attention until lately, they could hardly have been long advocated by either lecturer, so as to raise much party spirit. A work published by William Perkins, in 1591, gave them a new and powerful impulse[1]. Hereafter, men began to see the full consequences of Calvinistic speculations, and to be confirmed, or shaken in them, as they were severally inclined. Travers and Hooker had prepared fuel for the rising flame, predestination and its kindred figuring in their famous Temple controversy. But all these contentions were merely prelusive. Something still was wanting to make the two parties look for all their armour, and range them in determined hostility against each other.

---

[1] The work was translated into English for the use of unlearned clergymen.—STRYPE. *Annals.* ii. pt. 2. p. 146.

The needed missile came from William Barret, fellow of Caius College, Cambridge. Preaching a *clerum*, for the degree of bachelor in divinity, in the beginning of Easter term[2], he made a formal attack upon Calvin's peculiar doctrines. Even that Reformer himself, with other eminent divines of his party, were treated in the most contemptuous manner, and students were exhorted to abstain from reading them. The seniors heard indignantly such reflections upon their own principles and venerated authorities; from one, too, who could plead neither age nor station. They convented Barret before them[3], and easily brought him to see the indecency of

[1] *Armilla Aurea*, or, *The Golden chain; containing the Order of the Causes of Salvation and Damnation, according to the Word of God.*—HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 342.

[2] April 29.—FULLER. *Hist. Univ. Cambr.* 150.

[3] May 5.—*Ibid.*

his freedoms with authors of established character. They wrought even, seemingly, some change in his theology, and he consented to a public retractation. This he read, however[1], as if to show himself unaltered in sentiment, and only driven to the task by fears for his bread. The Calvinists now considered his offence more inexcusable than ever, and their uneasiness was aggravated by knowing him to be little else than a pioneer. They could not go into a bookseller's without seeing that their divinity was growing out of fashion. The works with which their own studies had been furnished, were disappearing from commercial stocks. Their accustomed places now were occupied by divines, either professedly Romish, or treating Calvin's peculiarities in a manner very different from himself[2]. Thus, it was plain, that authors, on whom elder theologians of the day relied implicitly, were becoming unsaleable, and that a party was arising which would not take doctrine from Geneva any more than discipline. This transfer of authority to a new school, from which they must expect no deference, and which they thought unsound in principle, was naturally painful to the Cambridge seniors, and they made a formal call upon the archbishop for his interference.

He seems to have imbibed that general persuasion of the Calvinistic divinity, which was usual among English Protestants of his standing. But as its peculiarities attracted very little notice during the consistorian heats, which occupied him in early life, he had, probably, never sifted it, and certainly he did not view it through any party medium. Hence Hooker's modifications, that gave so much offence in many quarters, were no hinderance to his patronage and advocacy. Nor did a formal attack upon Genevan views of reprobation at St. Paul's cross, nearly eleven years ago, prevent him from admitting the preacher among his chaplains[1]. Nor did he pass uncensured some parts of the retractation extorted from Barret[2].

---

[1] May 10. "After the reading thereof, he concluded thus, *Hæc dixi*, as if all had been oral rather than cordial. Yea, soon after, he departed the University, got beyond sea, turned a Papist, returned into England, where he led a layman's life to the day of his death."—FULLER. *ut supra.* 151.

[2] The Vice-chancellor of Cambridge, and others, to Archbishop Whitgift, June 12, 1595. The archbishop, it appears, had also recommended a search in several private studies. This had the same mortifying results.—STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 235.

---

[1] "He received into his service Mr. Samuel Harsnet, then being one of the fellows of Pembroke-hall; who, in a sermon, preached at St. Paul's cross, the 27th of October, 1584, had so dissected the whole Zuinglian doctrine of reprobation, as made it seem most ugly to the ears of his auditors, as afterwards in the eyes of all spectators, when it came to be printed. Which man he did not only entertain as his chaplain at large, but used his service in his house as a servant in ordinary, employed him in many of his affairs, and finally commended him to the care of King James; by whom he was first made master of Pembroke-hall, and afterwards preferred to the see of Chichester, from thence translated to Norwich, and at last to York."—HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 345.

[2] The archbishop wrote to Cambridge, "That in some points of his retractation, they had made him to affirm that which was contrary to the doctrine holden and expressed by many sound and learned divines in the Church of England, and in other churches likewise, men of the best account: and that which, for his own part, he thought to be false and contrary to the Scriptures. For the Scriptures were plain, that God, by his absolute will, did not hate and reject any man, without an eye to his sin. There might be impiety in believing the one; there could be none in believing the other. Neither was it contrary to any article of religion established by authority in this Church of England; but rather agreeable thereunto." He thought likewise that Barret had not contradicted the Articles, in maintaining that "no one ought to be secure of salvation," and that "faith may fail totally, but not finally." He disapproved of pulpit attacks upon Calvin and other learned men, but considered them no worse than the like upon Jerome, and other Fathers, which had been often heard in the University. He even deemed it allowable to censure Calvin for his reflections upon Henry VIII. and the Church of England. Barret, however, seems, in his offensive sermon, really never to have named Calvin, only to have uttered invec-

When, however, he found Cambridge in a violent ferment, and Dr. Whitaker, whom every scholar highly valued, losing ground as a teacher of theology, he readily came into measures for asserting the supremacy of received opinions. In the autumn, Whitaker, with some other leading men from Cambridge, met at his town-residence[1], and from their deliberations came the celebrated Lambeth Articles. These embody, in nine propositions, the distinctive principles of Calvinism, and such as approve that system, were long anxious to see them an authorized appendage to the Thirty-nine Articles[2]. If this desire had been gratified, none but unflinching Calvinists could have taught in the Church of England. The Lambeth Articles are sufficient for carrying out Calvin's principles, to all those lengths that revolt opponents, and are little suspected by many of the predestinarian party[3]. The

---

tives which all knew to be meant for him. This reserve was insufficient. The preacher could not obtain his degree.—Strype. *Whitgift*. ii. 236. 237. 240.

[1] Nov. 10.—Collier. ii. 644.

[2] This was formally proposed by Dr. Reynolds, at the Hampton Court conference, in 1604. He styled them, "The Nine Orthodoxical Assertions." They were actually inserted, together with other puritanical principles, in the Irish Articles, in 1615.

[3] The following are the Lambeth Articles:—" 1. God, from eternity, hath predestinated certain men unto life, certain men He hath reprobated. 2. The moving, or efficient cause of predestination unto life, is not the foresight of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of any thing that is in the person predestinated, but only the good will and pleasure of God. 3. There is pre-determined a certain number of the predestinate, which can neither be augmented, nor diminished. 4. Those who are not predestinated to salvation, shall necessarily be damned for their sins. 5. A true, living, and justifying faith, and the Spirit of God justifying, is not extinguished, falleth not away, it vanisheth not away in the elect, either finally, or totally. 6. A man truly faithful, that is, such a one who is endued with a justifying faith, is certain, with the full assurance of faith, of the remission of his sins, and of his everlasting salvation by Christ. 7. Saving grace is not given, is not granted, is not communicated to all men, by which they may be saved, if they will. 8. No man can come unto Christ,

queen was displeased with Whitgift for authorizing this kind of addition to the creed regularly sanctioned[1]. She seems to have talked, half-jocularly, of his conduct as an interference with her prerogative, savouring of a *præmunire*[2]. But he excused himself, by declaring the nine propositions to be nothing more than explanations,

---

unless it shall be given him, and unless the Father shall draw him; and all men are not drawn by the Father, that they may come to the Son. 9. It is not in the will or power of every one to be saved." (Fuller. B. ix. p. 230.) These Articles were concluded on Nov. 20. (Strype. *Whitgift.* ii. 279.) There are among the MSS. in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, certain fragments of Hooker's, first published in Mr. Keble's edition of his works, and in them appears the following matter, evidently the writer's view of the doctrines embodied in the Lambeth Articles. "1. That God hath predestinated certain men, not all men. 2. That the cause moving Him hereunto was not the foresight of any virtue in us at all. 3. That to Him the number of his elect is definitely known. 4. That it cannot be but their sins must condemn them to whom the purpose of his saving mercy doth not extend. 5. That to God's foreknown elect, final continuance of grace is given. 6. That inward grace whereby to be saved is deservedly not given unto all men. 7. That no man cometh unto Christ, whom God by the inward grace of his spirit draweth not. 8. And that it is not in every, no not in any man's own mere ability, freedom, and power to be saved, no man's salvation being possible without grace. Howbeit God is no favourer of sloth; and, therefore, there can be no such absolute decree touching man's salvation, as on our part includeth no necessity of care and travail, but shall certainly take effect, whether we ourselves do wake or sleep." (ii. 752.) The MS. ends there. It is chiefly valuable for showing that Hooker shrank from the doctrine of divine reprobation, and was generally disposed for a more moderate view of these mysterious subjects than the bulk of his contemporaries.

[1] Sir Robert Cecil, by royal command, to Archbishop Whitgift. Dec. 5, 1595.—Strype. *Whitgift.* ii. 286.

[2] "There goes a tradition, that the queen should, in merriment, say jestingly to the archbishop, *My Lord, I now shall want no money, for I am informed all your goods are forfeited unto me, by your calling a council without my consent:* but how much of truth herein God knows." (Fuller. B. ix. p. 232.) Elizabeth's chief objection to the Lambeth Articles turned upon the impolicy of calling "weak, ignorant minds" to such speculations. Otherwise, the archbishop wrote, "her majesty was persuaded of the truth of the propositions."—Strype. *Whitgift.* ii. 284. 286.

urgently needed at Cambridge, of some portions in the Thirty-nine Articles, and Elizabeth was easily appeased[1].

Many consider the archbishop's construction perfectly well founded. Others view the Lambeth Articles as hastily provided under temporary pressure. At all events, they are evidence that Calvinism need not be deduced from the Thirty-nine[2]. If these had been composed under the full influence of that system, an urgent call would never have been heard for nine supplemental propositions. The plea of explanation, merely, is obviously open to dispute. Prepossession might rather add and misrepresent. In this instance, it aimed, undoubtedly, at the imposition of an unauthorized commentary, as a rider to an authorized text: an assumption, which the queen acted wisely in repelling[1]. It is always injudicious to tighten the terms of conformity unnecessarily. Nor had such a mistake been legalised, after the Lambeth sessions terminated, is it at all certain, that even the private opinions of those who framed the Thirty-nine Articles would have been followed. A mere Calvinistic bias in them is far from universally acknowledged. It is hardly doubtful that their compilers rather looked for theology to the Confession of Augsburg, than to any other contemporary source. Hence those who contend against any necessity for construing them upon Genevan principles, have never been at any loss to make out a strong case. They have, in fact, a very powerful auxiliary in the Lambeth Articles. Upon their preparation, even Whitaker entered, partial as he was, under an expressed conviction, that no test had been hitherto provided sufficient for the protection of his peculiar opinions. He and his associates necessarily disclaimed all intention of defining any thing out of strict correspondence with established formularies.

---

[1] In a letter to the Heads of Houses, carried home by the Lambeth committee, Nov. 24, the archbishop says, "The propositions, nevertheless, must be so taken and used as their private judgements; thinking them to be true, and correspondent to the doctrine taught in the Church of England, and established by the laws of the land: and not as laws and decrees." (STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 282.) Besides caution, hesitation appears to be in this passage. The archbishop goes only so far as *correspondence.* He does not venture to say, that his party had merely drawn principles from the Thirty-nine Articles, unquestionably contained in them.

[2] "We are fully persuaded that Mr. Barret hath taught untruth, *if not against the Articles,* yet against the religion of our Church, publicly received, and always held in her Majesties reign, and maintained in all sermons, disputations, and lectures. *Although these points were not concluded and defined by public authority,* yet forasmuch as they have been hitherto evermore in our Church held, I refer it to your Grace's wisdom to judge, how inconvenient and offensive it is to have the same now controuled in this manner, and what consequence may depend thereupon." (Dr. Whitaker to Archbishop Whitgift. *Ibid.* Append. XXV. p. 338.) This admission from a decided Calvinist, living near the time when the Thirty-nine Articles were drawn up, is valuable to those who consider them not Calvinistic. Perhaps it is not very consistent with the archbishop's representation of *correspondence* between the Lambeth Articles and the Thirty-nine. It was, however, written first, and probably the committee, when they came to examine narrowly, thought themselves warranted in going so far as to claim *correspondence,* though they could not venture any further.

Dr. Whitaker's labours closed with the Lambeth Articles. He caught cold in his absence from home, and only returned to Cambridge to die, being under forty-seven. He had been greatly distinguished in controversy with Cardinal Bellarmine, and was learned and amiable above most men. His family was gentlemanly, seated in Lancashire, and he was nephew to Nowell, dean of St. Paul's.

---

[1] The archbishop "declared in all humble manner, that he and his associates had not made any canons, articles, or decrees, with an intent that they should serve hereafter for a standing rule to direct the Church; but only had resolved upon some propositions to be sent to Cambridge, for quieting some unhappy differences in that university. With which answer her Majesty being somewhat pacified, commanded, notwithstanding, that he should speedily recall and suppress those Articles. Which was performed with such care and diligence, that a copy of them was not to be found for a long time after."—HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 344.

They had no authority, or pretence of any kind, for adding to the national creed. Any such attempt might even be punishable by *præmunire.* Their plea, however, has upon the face of it no firmer foundation than individual judgment. From this others may allowably dissent, and very fairly urge the conduct of this very committee as a corroboration of their views. Its labours were undertaken, because the Articles were found insufficiently Calvinistic. Upon its own agreement with doctrines really authorized, certainty may be unattainable. But it is perfectly plain, that Calvinism cannot claim assent from those who minister in the Church of England, until some test shall be provided more stringent than the Thirty-nine Articles. Hence it reasonably follows, either that the framers of these were not Calvinists at all, or that they were not so persuaded of the system as to feel under a necessity of imposing it upon others.

A little before his journey to Lambeth, the learned Whitaker preached a *clerum* at Cambridge, upon the controverted points. He appears to have taken that high Calvinistic ground which readily bewilders even the deepest heads[1]. The gauntlet thus thrown down by one professor, was promptly taken-up by the other. A *clerum* by Baron, in the following term, argued on the other side[2]. He professed merely to expose a foreign divine, and carefully avoided any direct collision with the recent

---

[1] Whitaker's *clerum* was delivered at the beginning of Michaelmas term. It was sent to Lord Burghley, Nov. 19, from the deanery, St. Paul's, where the learned preacher was staying with his uncle, being then in attendance at Lambeth. The aged Lord Treasurer told him, "that as for his sermon *ad clerum*, it contained mysteries too high for his understanding."—STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 287.

[2] Jan. 12, 1596.—*Ibid.* 290.

Lambeth Articles[1]. But his doctrine being really in their teeth, he gave serious offence to the Calvinistic seniors. When the queen heard of this new disturbance, she, too, was displeased; looking, probably, upon the learned foreigner as an officious reviver of contentions, that might otherwise have died away[2]. The leading men at Cambridge immediately became anxious to give his dismissal to an instructor so much at variance with them, and, in their judgment, intent upon disseminating pernicious errors. But Whitgift shielded him for a while. He found himself, however, so uncomfortable, that he gave up all thought of retaining his professorship, and retired to London[1].

---

[1] "In the midst of his sermon, he asserted these three things:—1. That God created all men according to his own likeness in Adam, and so consequently to eternal life. From which he chased no man, unless because of sin. As Damasus taught, *lib.* 2. *De Fid. Orthodox.* 2. That Christ died sufficiently for all: against Joh. Piscator, a foreigner, who denied it: whose opinion he showed was contrary to the confession of the Church of England, and the Articles approved by the parliament of this kingdom, and confirmed by the queen's authority. And for proof thereof, repeated the 31st Article. 3. That the promises of God made to us, as they are generally propounded to us, were to be generally understood: as it is set-down in the 17th Article." (STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 290.) He wrote to the archbishop, Jan. 14, "That he spake according to those old and orthodox Articles, and did not so much as touch these new." (*Ibid.* 292.) In another letter to the archbishop, Feb. 4, he says, "Why should they so much urge that I spake against the Articles, when I said openly in my sermon, that I spoke against Piscator? From whose book, when I saw it to be read by, and in the hands of many, I thought I had a just cause to say what I did against him. And my accusers themselves had said that they did not like him."—*Ibid.* 308.

[2] Archbishop Whitgift wrote to the Vice-chancellor of Cambridge, Jan. 16, that he had signified to Baron, by Dr. Neville, "how hardly her Majesty had been informed against him for these causes; and how unfit it was, that he, being a stranger, and receiving such courtesy and friendship here, of good will, and not for any need we had of him, (God be thanked,) should be so busy in another commonwealth, and make himself, as it were, author of new stirs and contentions in this Church."—*Ibid.* 296.

Two doctrinal parties now took decidedly opposite positions, and on them they still remain entrenched. The Calvinists, though not exclusively Dissenters, form a compact body with several distinctive features. Especially are they much more of partisans than Churchmen commonly reckoned Arminians. In this latter body, party character rather shows itself in resistance than activity: thus impairing the influence of greater numbers. Another advantage to Calvinism is the little notice ordinarily taken of extreme conclusions deducible from its premises. There are always individuals fully aware of these, and willing to admit them all, rather than abandon an *iota* of their cherished opinions. But followers, generally, of the Genevese reformer, call themselves moderate Calvinists, being prepared only for such a qualified adhesion to their master as would exclude all startling admissions. Up to this point, Calvinistic principles have strong attractions for the human mind. Irrespective predestination has, indeed, elements for engendering despair. But it rarely does: perhaps never under mental health. Belief in it passes ordinarily as evidence of unquestionable security. The holders feel sure of their own indefeasible superiority over an unhappy mass created for destruction. Human passions listen readily to such flattery. Churchmen, not so sanguine, or shy of premises involving unpalatable conclusions, may fairly dwell both upon the time and manner in which Calvinistic theories first attracted considerable notice. They were then, undoubtedly, found in general possession. But England owes not her Articles to that generation, nor was its attention early fixed upon the doctrinal peculiarities of Calvinism, nor had it even time, until wearing away, for canvassing them minutely. It was long absorbed by externals and regulations, condemned or recommended at Geneva. Controversies upon these abated before Calvin doctrinally could come under a searching scrutiny. He was then pronounced wanting by theologians of unquestionable competence. Nor were these founders of a school, that many would call Arminian by anticipation, admitted innovators. They professed merely to follow the standard authorities of reformed England[1]. If this position had been palpably untenable, what occasion was there for the Lambeth Articles? How, besides, would Whitgift have been justified in patronising able men unprepared for the full admission of them? His conduct shows him sufficiently aware that Calvinism was no necessary condition of Anglican conformity. He pleaded only for its *correspondence* with established tests[2].

---

[1] The Margaret professor was chosen for two years, and customarily re-elected, but Baron's time having expired, he did not so much as offer himself again for re-election. (COLLIER. ii. 647.) Baron lived several years in London, after his retirement from Cambridge, and was buried with considerable respect in the church of St. Olave, Hart Street. He left a numerous progeny. His name is commonly written, even by himself, Baro.—STRYPE. *Annals*. iv. 322.

---

[1] Collier cites the Homilies for the nativity and the resurrection, as evidences that Calvinism did not prevail in those who prepared these authorized discourses. He draws also the same inference from Jewel's *Defence of the Apology*, and from Nowell's *Catechism;* likewise from the general stream of reformed theology, under the queen's father and brother. Hence he considers the Lambeth Articles as innovations, at variance with the "old doctrine" upon which the Church was reformed. —*Eccl. Hist.* ii. 645. 648.

[2] "Some have adventured hereupon to rank this most reverend archbishop in the list of these Calvinists; conceiving that he could not otherwise have agreed to these Articles, if he had not been himself of the same opinion. And possible it is, that he might not

But that is a matter of opinion. Were it, however, certain that Calvinists drew the Articles, yet, unless they meant exclusion for all others, every such person is really within their view. Subscription is, in fact, honourably open to both parties. The Calvinist esteems the test especially calculated for him. His opponent can see no such intention, or even any reason to admit so much as a Calvinistic bias in the Articles. As the grounds taken

---

look so far into them, as to consider the ill consequences which might follow on them; or that he might prefer the pacifying of some present dissenters, before the apprehension of such inconveniences as were more remote; or else, according to the custom of all such as be in authority, he thought it necessary to preserve Whitaker in power and credit, against all such as did oppose him; the merit and abilities of the man being very eminent. For if this argument were good, it might as logically be inferred, that he was a Jesuit, or a Melancthonian at the least, in these points of doctrine, because he countenanced those men who openly and professedly had opposed the Calvinian." (Heylin. *Hist. Presb.* 345.) It is plain that Archbishop Whitgift had no very decided bias on either side. Doctrinal Calvinism had been very little canvassed in England, until after the date of his theological studies. "All the Protestant divines in the Church, whether Puritans or others, seemed of one mind hitherto about the doctrines of faith; but now there arose a party which were first for softening, and then for overthrowing the received opinions about *predestination, perseverance, free-will, effectual grace*, and *the extent of our Saviour's redemption.* The Articles of the Church of England were thought by all men hitherto to favour the explication of Calvin." (Neal. i. 497.) "The only light in which the Lambeth Articles can properly be regarded, is that of a testimony to the opinions then prevalent in the English Church. In this point of view they constitute an interesting and an important historical document, to which the Calvinistic interpreters of the Thirty-nine Articles may confidently appeal." (Price. i. 436.) No doubt high Calvinistic opinions were entertained by those who framed the Lambeth Articles, by the seniors at Cambridge, and by many other eminent persons; but others, as eminent, Hooker among them, would go to no such lengths. Their *prevalence*, though general, was not universal. *Appeals* to the Lambeth Articles, by Calvinistic interpreters of the Thirty-nine, are not likely to be made with any great *confidence* by those who recollect Whitgift's plea of *correspondence* merely, and Whitaker's admission that the disputed points had *not been concluded and defined by public authority.*

by both parties labour under some obscurity, each is entitled to forbearance from the other. An exclusive spirit on either side, is liable to the censure earned by the Lambeth Articles. It would impose an arbitrary commentary to narrow an established text.

Another doctrinal difference which called out all the heat of party, has long sunk into complete oblivion. Calvin understood our Lord's *Descent into Hell*, to mean, that he suffered in spirit, at Gethsemane and Calvary, all the torments in store for lost souls[1]. Early in Elizabeth's reign, Harpsfield, under the name of Alan Cope, had pointed to this opinion, as a stain of heterodoxy upon the Reformation[2]. It passed, however, onwards, with very little notice. The public mind, occupied by Disciplinarian strife, wanted room for subtler speculations. Hence here, as elsewhere, Calvin's authority went undisputedly for law. When polity was no longer an engrossing question, this, like other doctrines, rushed into the void. Hugh Broughton, a learned, but arrogant Orientalist, charged the Genevese school with mistaking a local description for metaphor. *Hell*, he said, was the Greek *Hades*, no place of eternal punishment, but one for the general reception of disembodied spirits; to the holy, a happy region, really synonymous with *paradise*[1]. This interpretation, at first, gave great offence to elder men, persuaded of the other. Among them was Archbishop Whitgift; whose doctrinal prejudices had largely been imbibed from Calvin. As, however, Broughton remained unshaken, the local sense made continual progress among scholars. At length, Whitgift came over to it himself, and the question was canvassed more keenly than ever. To stay the contention, Bishop Bilson exposed a metaphorical construction, at St. Paul's cross, in the Lent of this year[2]. This new attack upon their master's divinity, was warmly resented by the Calvinistic party, and a young man, soon afterwards, from the same pulpit, controverted such doctrine, as Jesuitic[3]. Bilson now felt his professional character at stake. In preaching one of the Spital sermons after Easter, he produced, accordingly, a laboured confirmation of his former doctrine. Subsequently, he vindicated it, in a regular treatise[1]. The Puritans, however, did not readily abandon their great authority. During several years, they maintained, even in their catechisms, our Saviour's endurance in spirit of infernal torments[2].

---

[1] NEAL. i. 501. HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 350. Bishop Pearson thus gives, from the *Institutes*, Calvin's view: "The Descent into Hell is suffering the torments of hell: that the soul of Christ did really and truly suffer all those pains which are due unto the damned; that whatsoever is threatened by the law unto them which depart this life in their sins and under the wrath of God, was fully undertaken and borne by Christ; that he died a true and natural death, the death of *Gehenna*, and this dying the death of *Gehenna* was the *descending into Hell;* that those who are now saved by virtue of his death, should otherwise have endured the same torments in hell which now the damned do and shall endure, but that He, being their surety, did Himself suffer the same for them even all the torments, which we should have felt, and the damned shall." (*Exposition of the Creed.* Lond. 1683. p. 230.) Calvin appears to have thought highly of this explanation, pronouncing the clause in the Creed, on which it is built, "quæ rei maxime utile ac minime spernendum mysterium continet."—*Inst.* II. xvi. 8.

[2] *Dialogi VI.* p. 824.

---

[1] "Broughton had also, in another letter to the Archbishop, shewed that *hell*, in our divinity and translations of the Old Testament, interpreted but שאול *sheol*, which requires all to come (as that word in Hebrew signifieth) and ᾅδην, *i. e.* the *world unseen*. And that *hell* is that which *haleth* all hence, whether joy of *paradise*, or torment of *gehenna*, be their lot there. And again that *hell* must be taken as in old Saxon (when they knew no *gehenna*) for the state after this life." (STRYPE. *Whitgift*. ii. 321.) The Orientalist was mistaken about Saxon. *Helle*, in that language, sometimes means *gehenna*, and it has no connection with *haling*, as is ridiculously said. It is, however, generally the translation of ᾅδης, and seems properly identical in meaning, being derived, probably, from *helan, to cover*, or *conceal*.

[2] "Because some new writers vary touching the sufferings and merits of Christ on the cross, I acquainted my Lord of Canterbury, that I could hardly wade through that doctrine effectually, but I must refute in words, if not by proofs, the late device of some writers, that Christ's suffering in soul the pains of the damned, is the chiefer and principaler part of our redemption. And that, without that, the death of his cross, and blood shed for us, as they say, had otherwise done us little good."—Bishop Bilson to Lord Burghley. May 19, 1597. STRYPE. *Whitgift*. ii. 362.

[3] "It pleased a Bachelor of Art,

While Calvin was thus upon the wane, in England, his drooping influence found one of those active partisans that injure every cause they seek to serve. John Darrel, a bachelor of arts, was carried away by a spirit of fanatical vanity, before ordination, to claim miraculous powers. When under four-and-twenty, he acted exorciser, in a possession scene, over a Derbyshire girl of seventeen. This feat passed for something only moderately wonderful, there being no talk of more than a single devil in the possessed. But the damsel's performance gave so much satisfaction, that she quickly announced a demoniacal invasion upon a larger scale. Darrel now reaped the glory of ejecting eight devils from her[3]. His next passport to fame was a youngster of fourteen, known afterwards from his place of residence, as the Boy of Burton. Darrel was equally successful with him, and a neighbour-

---

as I have heard, even at Paul's cross, cunningly, as he thought, to undermine the doctrine which I taught, under the name of the Jesuits', and to direct his words against them; but indeed to reach at the conclusions which the preacher supposed I have published."—STRYPE. *Whitgift. ad eund.*

[1] *A Survey of Christ's Sufferings*, published in 1604. Bishop Bilson maintained that Christ, in his real descent, achieved a victory over Satan: a notion that prevailed in England, before the importations from Geneva.

[2] HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 350.

[3] "Of which he himself writ the history, and gave a copy of it to the Lady Bowes. This was about the year 1586."—STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 346.

ing minister was weak enough to publish a puffing pamphlet upon the case[1]. Ignorant people were so caught by these exhibitions, that the exorcist became quite intoxicated, and assumed a ridiculous importance. This was fed by an invitation into Lancashire, where several persons were impatient for his exhibitions. Seven expectants were produced at once, and Darrel's part was acted with as much applause as ever[2]. Six of those who played demoniacs, were females, and one of them was quickly engaged by the Seminary-priests, who abounded in a district, like Lancashire, full of Romanists. They thought Popery quite equal to win a share in the harvest of renown, that Puritanism was reaping: and they thought correctly[3]. Their pattern had now gone to Nottingham[4], where he was awaited by an artful boy, seemingly a ventriloquist, with no common command of muscle[1]. His case pushed Darrel's reputation to its zenith. It was also substantially beneficial, by recommending him to a lectureship[2]. Society was really very little above these miserable impostures, even in its more intellectual grades, but party lent it an infusion of unusual discernment. Darrel, and his dupes, were zealous Puritans. Among his doings, was the testing of different prayers. He tried sometimes the Common Prayer, but nothing from it seemed of any great efficiency. When, however, he poured forth, as if by inspiration, some extemporaneous flight, the other performer shewed instant signs of important amelioration[3]. The Nottingham churchmen dis-

---

[1] "Of this also a book was written by one Rice, a saddler in the same town, and contracted by one Mr. Dennison, a minister: which was seen and allowed by Darrel, and Mr. Hilderstram, another minister." (STRYPE. *Whitgift.* 341.) Heylin says that the bulky draught of this production was lumbered-together by Jesse Bee, whom he calls "a religious sad lyar" a pun upon the author's trade which posterity would have been at a loss to understand, if only acquainted with these transactions from the *History of the Presbyterians.*

[2] "Of this dispossessing of those seven spirits, one Mr. Deacon, a preacher at Leigh, wrote a book; which was justified from point to to point, by one More, another preacher of his own allowance; but very childishly done: which More had joined himself with Darrel in that pretended dispossession."—STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 341.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] "He was importuned by one of the ministers and several inhabitants of the town of Nottingham, to visit one William Somers, a boy that had such convulsive agonies, as were thought to be preternatural, insomuch that when Mr. Darrel had seen them, he concluded with the rest of the spectators, that he was possessed, and advised his friends to desire the help of godly and learned ministers to endeavour his recovery, lest if the devil should be dispossessed, the common people should attribute to him some special gift of casting out devils; but upon a second request from the mayor of Nottingham, he agreed with Mr. Aldridge, and two other ministers, with about one hundred and fifty neighbouring Christians, to set apart a day for fasting and prayer,

---

to intreat the Lord to cast out Satan, and deliver the young man from his torments; and after some time, the Lord, they say, was intreated, and they blessed God for the same: this was November, 1597." (NEAL. i. 503.) This is Darrel's own account, favourably abridged, with a slight inaccuracy. His first opinion of the boy's case was not upon sight, but upon the contents of a letter. His "disabling of himself," as the phrase ran, was a piece of decency more than usually common in that age. Newly-elected speakers of the House of Commons especially, make themselves look ridiculous by such words of course.

[1] He spoke sometimes distinctly with his mouth shut, at others, with it open, but without moving his lips. He seems to have had the power of raising a protuberance on the surface of his body, and of shifting it from one part to another. Five or six men had been known hardly able to hold him. He could lie livid, and seemingly breathless, for an hour together.—STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 342.

[2] "Darrel is hereupon made lecturer of the town of Nottingham (that being the fish for which he angled) as being thought a marvellous bug to scare the devil. And though he had no lawful calling in that behalf, yet was this given out to be so comfortable a vocation, and so warrantable in the sight of God, that very few ministers have had the like; there being no preacher settled there (as he gave it out) since her Majesty's reign; as if neither parsons, nor vicars, nor any that bear such Popish names, might pass for preachers."—HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 348.

[3] "Now what this plot was may appear by this which is de-

credited by this kind of argument, took the celebrated boy from his parents, and placed him under the custody of two men. He soon fell into fits. But his keepers only talked of flagellation, and of pinching him, if birch failed, with pincers. Upon such modes of ejecting Satan, he had never calculated, and serious preparation for them wrought a sudden recovery[1]. A full confession followed, but this the boy retracted, on a prospect of escaping from the sceptical and stern exorcists. Darrel, with others, now interfered, and a commission sate for investigating the truth. This was entertained by tales and prevarications, until its two days' labour was abruptly closed by a seasonable series of fits[2]. The town generally could

---

posed by Mr. More, one of Mr. Darrel's great admirers and companions, *viz. That when a prayer was read out of the Common Prayer Book, in the hearing of those which were possessed in Lancashire, the devils in them were little moved by it; but afterwards, when Mr. Darrel, and one Mr. Deacon did severally use such prayers, as for the present* occasion they had *conceived, then* (saith he) *the wicked spirits were much more troubled* (or rather, the wicked spirits did much more torment the parties) *so little, do premeditated prayers, which are read out of a book; and so extremely, do extemporary and conceived prayers torment the devil.*" (HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 349.) "More, one that was as cunning as Darrel in dealing with Satan, saith, *That the faith of the Church, established under pastors and teachers, &c. shall bring forth this fruit, namely to cast out devils.* And so Darrel, in this book, called an *Apology,* intimated; writing, *That the work of God prospered, to the great good of that town* (of Nottingham) *for thereby the word of God grew mightily and prevailed.* And shewing himself zealous for the platform, condemned himself for taking orders before he had a call to a flock, *in becoming a stipendiary preacher in that town, and having sought for the outward calling of our Church, before he had a flock to depend upon him. But this,* he said, *was done by him out of a zeal without knowledge.*" —STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 346.

[1] *Ibid.* 343.

[2] The sheriff of the county was at the head of this commission. Heylin says that it was chiefly composed of Darrel's friends, and that its return was, That the boy was no counterfeit. Neal speaks of his fits before this body, as occasioned by fright. There is, however, no reason to think them different from their too-famous predecessors. The boy seems to

only wonder and pity. But the more powerful parties, whose treatment had been so immediately successful before, insisted upon trying it again. The reluctant youth soon, accordingly, found himself once more under his inexorable guardians, with rods and pincers ready. For their medicine his appetite was not at all improved, and mere loathing of it immediately effected a perfect cure[1].

As, however, human nature, whether from pride or fondness, parts unwillingly with hallucination, the multitude would hear nothing of imposture. This famous possession-case was canvassed in all the acrimony of party zeal, and Nottingham became violently excited. Youth and ignorance were haunted by oppressive apprehensions of witches and devils. People cowered before darkness, and a servant begged for company, when sent into a cellar. The pulpits were infected by this epidemic; weak or artful preachers seasoning their sermons with frightful pictures of Satanic agency[2]. The government being driven to notice this commotion, Darrel was brought before the High Commission Court, at Lambeth. Exhibiting there a front of senseless audacity, he was at once considered an impostor, and committed to prison. Subsequently, he and another clergyman were degraded from their ministry, and closely confined[3]. In the Gate-

---

have admitted this, on the last day of the same month, before the mayor of Nottingham, and some justices of the peace, "and within three days after, acts all his tricks before the Lord Chief Justice, at the public assizes. Upon this news, the boy of Burton also makes a like confession."—*Hist. Presb.* 349.

[1] "And of late added this, that Darrel was confederate with him therein; and for these four last years instructed and trained him up thereunto."—STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 344.

[2] *Ibid.* 345.

[3] "After a full hearing before the Archbishop, Bishop of London, the Lord Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, and the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, Dr. Cæsar, Master of Requests, Dr. Byng, Dean of the

house, he wrote a pamphlet, apologising for himself, and the Nottingham lad. In this, he speaks with a mixture of humility and confidence, that could hardly have been all counterfeit[1]. He was, probably, a weak man with some good elements in his moral composition. But he must have lent himself to an inordinate vanity that seared his understanding, and half paralysed his conscience. Unless his intellects were greatly lower, than they must reasonably be rated, he could not have acted in so many fooleries, without some misgivings. Nor would the young people, who figured under him, have given a miserable testimony to Puritanism, without some degree of leading from himself. Darrel's honesty, therefore, is far from unimpeachable, and his conduct had been so perseveringly mischievous, as to earn much of the severity that overtook him. Even this was far more excusable than many such proceedings under Elizabeth. The unfortunate prisoner, though personally contemptible and pitiable, was no obscure impostor. Pamphlets blazoned his meretricious fame, and a halo of importance played about him, from the glare of which, ignorance claimed protection.

The last parliament, in its zeal against Brown and Barrow, brought religion more completely than ever

---

Arches, and others, the said Darel, was by full agreement of the court, condemned for a counterfeit; and together with More, his companion, both deposed from the ministry, and committed close prisoners."—STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 346.

[1] "Surely, if these things prove true, let me be registered to my perpetual infamy, not only for a most notorious deceiver, but such an hypocrite as never trod upon the earth before. Yea, Lord, (for to thee I convert my speech, who best knowest all things) if I be guilty of these things laid to my charge, if I have confederated more or less, with Sommers," (the Nottingham lad) "Darling," (the boy of Burton) "or any of the rest; if ever I set eye on them before they were possessed, then let me not only be made a laughing-stock and by-word unto all men, but rase my name also out of the book of life, and give me my portion with hypocrites."—*Ibid.* 347.

under cognisance of the common law courts. An evil from this was painfully shewn by Sir Edmund Anderson, Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, at two several assizes, for the county of Lincoln[1]. He seems to have imbibed a thorough detestation of Protestant Nonconformity, especially of Brownism, and his antipathy burst forth upon the bench, with all the coarseness of a half-civilised age. He could not mention the obnoxious doctrines without volleys of swearing and abuse. Lincolnshire he denounced as over-run with Brownism, and he declared himself determined upon rooting all Puritans out of the circuit. His intemperance appears to have been principally provoked by the trial of a clergyman, for omitting some part of the prayers in favour of the sermon. This offender, spitefully prosecuted by a neighbouring gentleman, to whom he refused a lease, was placed at the bar, and ordered to hold up his hand, like a felon. While standing thus degraded, Anderson saluted him as a *knave*, and a *rebellious knave*. That he was not much indisposed for some slight of the Common Prayer, is likely enough, as it is, that many of his neighbours were inclined in the same way. But he seems to have been both a subscriber to the Articles, and a general conformist to the Liturgy. Nor does the relater of his case admit any Brownist, or even Presbyterian bias, among the Lincolnshire clergy generally. He says, however, that Anderson's violence had been found injurious to them. Ever since his offensive circuits, clerical influence had lessened in the country. People thought clergymen under the ban of power, and were emboldened in venting their ill humours upon them[2].

---

[1] In 1596.

[2] "Since my Lord Anderson hath obtained to ride this circuit, the

In the autumn of this year, a new parliament was assembled[1]; chiefly for financial purposes. Its proceed-

---

ministry is grown into intolerable contempt: which is universally imputed to him, both by those that would, and those that would not have it so." . . . "The simple people rejoiced in their return homeward, saying that a minister's cause could not be so much as heard at the assizes, and gathered, that all preaching was now, as it were, cried down." (Imperfect Letter from Alford, from a clergyman unknown to a person of quality. STRYPE. *Annals.* iv. 367.) "It has been observed, that the bishops had now wisely transferred the prosecution of the Puritans from themselves to the temporal courts, so that, instead of being summoned before the High Commission, they were indicted at the assizes, and tried at common law; this being thought more advisable, to take off the odium from the Church." (NEAL. i. 504.) This is the introduction to Anderson's intemperance. It is afterwards said, "Thus the Puritan clergy were put upon a level with rogues and felons, and made to hold up their hands at the bar among the vilest criminals: there was hardly an assize in any county of England, but one, or more ministers, through the resentments of some of their parishioners, appeared in this condition." Whence this last piece of information came, does not appear. As to the former, if Neal had been more alive to the Puritanical zeal against Brownism, lately displayed in the House of Commons, he would, probably, have spared the sneer upon episcopal wisdom.

[1] Monday, Oct. 24. "Archbishop Whitgift was busy, this summer, about elections for the ensuing Parliament, which was to meet Oct. 24, 1597. Mr. Strype says, his Grace took what care he could to prevent such as were disaffected to the constitution of the Church, that is, all Puritans, from coming into the House; but some thought it a little out of character for an archbishop to appear so publicly in the choice of the people's representatives." (NEAL. i. 506.) "The archbishop himself also, in order to prevent the return of persons disaffected towards the Church, actively exerted himself in the elections for the Parliament, which met October 24, 1597." (PRICE. i. 438.) The authority cited is this: "The Archbishop took what care he could to prevent unfit men, especially disaffected to the present constitution of the Church, from coming there" (to Parliament). "We have one instance of this about this time; that when Sir William Brook, knight of the shire for Kent, was dead, the election for a new knight coming-on, January 16, he wrote to the suffragan of Dover, that his earnest desire was, that Sir Moyl Finch might be chosen thereunto. And prayed him, therefore, to use the utmost of his best endeavours, both by himself and friends, to gather what voices he could, against the same day, for the said Sir Moyl, and to bestow the same upon him.

ings evidence the decline of those religious heats which Elizabeth had usually found in the House of Commons. The puritanical party had not, however, quite forgotten its quarrel with ecclesiastical authority. But its complaints, and proposed remedies, interested civilians rather than divines. It attacked ecclesiastical courts, and existing facilities for contracting marriage. The queen heard of these proceedings, with her usual jealousy and irritation. She did not deny the probability of some ground for finding fault, only the legality of seeking redress from any but herself[1]. Ecclesiastical motions could not originate in the House of Commons without infringing her prerogative. The time had not come for disputing and defying such lofty pretensions. Hence those who hoped for a return to their constituents, decorated with the laurels of ecclesiastical reform, were merely mortified, as heretofore, by rebuke and disappointment.

In some particulars, authority called legislative atten-

Adding that it would be well, that his bailiffs would have warning to give notice thereof to all his tenants, servants, and friends, to whom it should appertain. And so not doubting of their readiness herein, he committed them to God. Dated from Lambeth." (STRYPE. *Whitgift*. ii. 373.) Thus a letter to a friend, in January, is, perhaps, rather hastily, thought by Strype, sufficient for saying, that the archbishop "took what care he could" to keep men unfavourable to the Church out of the House of Commons. This hint suffices to charge him with being "busy about elections all the summer," and to discover that "some thought" his conduct "a little out of character." Now, he was a large Kentish proprietor, and an occasional resident in the county. The candidate for whom he interested himself, might be a personal friend, and in his behalf, he sought assistance from a personal friend of his own, as also from his own "tenants, servants, and friends." We have no evidence of publicity in his conduct, or of his interference in any other election, or in any election, until a vacancy happened during the session of Parliament. Even were appearances of a more decided character, Dissenters would be liable to a severe retort, in pressing them heavily against a minister of religion.

[1] STRYPE. *Whitgift*. ii. 376.

tion to the Church establishment. Ejected Romish incumbents, or their representatives, yet claimed legal rights to benefices forfeited by nonconformity, and provided for a favourable opportunity to assert them, by making secret appeals. As acts of this kind by educated men, generally proceed upon some legal grounds, it was thought advisable, to pass a statute, confirming the deprivations that occurred soon after the queen's accession, and giving a new legal validity to all appointments of bishops and dignitaries, made during her first four years[1]. A similar service was rendered to the bishopric and chapter of Norwich. Some of the harpies who had obtained patents of concealment, found various flaws in the endowments conferred upon both. Pettifogging craft having made out a better case than common, it was referred to Sir Thomas Egerton, Lord Keeper, the two Chief Justices, and the Chief Baron, who regularly sate at York House, to hear and consider the pleadings of counsel[2]. The most eminent were employed, and it is clear that pillage had a fair prospect: otherwise, an act would hardly have been passed to cheat it of the prey. Such unhappy displays of legal erudition and acuteness raise, not unreasonably, popular prejudice against lawyers. Men overlook the labour and learning displayed in foiling a fraudulent aim ingeniously taken with a legal bow. They merely heap odium upon the profession, that gives to rapacious, unprincipled cunning, so many embarrassing advantages.

---

[1] Collier. ii. 658.

[2] "The method of these concealers was to inform the crown that the subject had usurped upon it, either by keeping some part of an estate surrendered to the crown, or by extending grants from the crown to lands not comprised within the conveyance. Upon this information, the concealers procured patents, or conveyances of such pretended concealed estates. To make their patent pass the better, they commonly had only some little part of the estate inserted, with other general words, which reached to a great deal more." (*Ibid.* 659.) The pleadings in this case inform us that the last surviving monk, who had been attached to the cathedral of Norwich, in its conventual state, did not die until the 18th of the queen.

The Convocation was not solely occupied, according to prevailing usage, in granting subsidies. The Articles passed by the Clerical Estate, some years ago[1], were introduced, with additions, and in this amplified form, were regularly sanctioned. Subsequently, they received the royal assent, and thus became legally binding[2]. They were evidently drawn to meet popular complaints of ecclesiastical courts, and of business transacted in them. They were, therefore, a concession to the House of Commons. Puritanical attacks upon the spiritual judicature, evidently retained a vigour which both discipline and doctrine had perceptibly lost.

The Romish party was kept in a feverish state by the encroaching spirit of Jesuitism. Wisbeach Castle had been, during several years, the principal place of confinement for priests, both secular and regular. Except loss of liberty, they had little ground of complaint, and at first, unanimity prevailed among them. The most distinguished individual of their party was Thomas Watson, deprived bishop of Lincoln. To him, the unfortunate inmates generally offered obedience, as a standing superior. But Watson, though naturally morose[1], found age and misfortune act favourably upon his temperament. He declined all superiority, saying, that affliction was an universal leveller, which made him esteem his equals in that respect, equal in every other[2]. He pleaded also, that any such assumption, without royal authority, was unconstitutional, and punishable by *præmunire*[3]. His death, and still more, Allen's, whose authority was paramount among English Romanists, filled Wisbeach with intolerable dissension. The Jesuits had long gained so much influence, that no priest was welcome in the generality of Romish houses, without an introduction from them[4]. They now claimed a formal pre-eminence over the seculars, and Weston, *alias* Edmonds, one of their order, was anxious to be acknowledged as chief of all the prisoners. He did not, indeed, aim at any very imposing title, merely requiring his brethren in misfortune to recognise him as their agent. For assuming this modest character, he pleaded something like a command from Henry Garnet, resident in London, as provincial of the Jesuits. This was very far from a recommendation to the seculars, whose jealousy and envy were all on fire. They, accordingly, would admit no interference whatever, from a society, so much more in favour than themselves. They denied all dependance upon any regulars, adding that pretences to it, came with grace, peculiarly bad, from such upstarts, as the Jesuits. If England were to see her ordinary clergy under monastic control, it ought surely, to be exercised by the Benedictines, whose venerable order could allege possession of a thousand years[1]. Nothing said, however, on either side, told favourably upon the other, and both parties eagerly appealed to an aged priest, universally respected, who came the welcome bearer of contributions. This chosen mediator charged the Jesuits with scandal, in separating from their brethren. They admitted it, but said that it was only *per accidens*. He then said, that it could not be continued without sin. They jeeringly asked, whether he meant mortal sin, or venial? Thus the two parties were left in attitudes of active and irreconcilable antipathy[2]. No mind alive to human frailty could exult over such a miserable scene, but it has been serviceable to the cause of truth. The seculars were galled by Jesuitic assumption, and lay approbation of it, into important extenuations of Elizabeth's Romish policy. Their angry pens have left statements, equally explicit and undeniable, that severity was earned by politics. Had Romanists proved a more united body, posterity would have heard from their own mouths, only of wanton persecution. Over their own earnings from a menaced, alarmed, embarrassed government, suspicion might have been thrown, because professed opponents were the only chroniclers[1].

---

[1] *Articuli pro clero*, passed in 1584. They were confirmed by royal authority, and are printed in Bishop Sparrow's *Collection*. 193. —WILKINS. iv. 315.

[2] *Capitula, sive Constitutiones Ecclesiasticæ, per Archiep. &c. in Syn. Lond.* 1597. SPARROW. 245. WILKINS. 352. They regulate: 1. Admissions into orders, and institutions to benefices. 2. Pluralities. 3. Residence of dignitaries upon their parochial cures. 4. The preaching of dignitaries by turns in cathedrals. 5. Marriage-licenses. 6. Divorces. 7. Excommunications. 8. The public denunciation of recusants and excommunicates. 9. Commutation of solemn penance. 10. Fees of ecclesiastical officials. 11. Excesses of apparitors. 12. Parish-registers. Those which apply to dignitaries, divorces, recusants, apparitors, and registers, are engrafted upon the *Articuli pro clero*.

---

[1] "Watsonus Lincolniensis, morosus homo, qui et ipse tamen laxius aliquandiu habitus in ædibus Episcopi Eliensis, postea Roffensis, tandem cum hîc per emissarios vestros turbatæ res, in arcem insulæ Eliensis, ablegatus est."—ANDREWES. *Tortura Torti.* 147.

[2] FULLER. B. ix. p. 225.

[3] *A Reply to a notorious Libel.* 113.

[4] *Ibid.* 107. 142. 311.

---

[1] This is an exaggeration. The Benedictine system was not established in England, until the latter half of the tenth century. Straggling monks of that order, were known earlier, and possibly, some slight attempts to introduce the society. Wilfrid claimed the distinction of introducing it, in the seventh century, and from this fact, probably, came the loose talk of a thousand years in round numbers.—See the *Anglo-Saxon Church*. 184. 87; second edition, 177. 97.

[2] FULLER. B. ix. p. 226. "Such of us as remained in prison at Wisbech (and were committed thither 1580, and others not long after committed thither, to the number of about thirty-three, or thirty-four) continued still in the several times of all the said most wicked designments, as we were before, and were never brought into any trouble for them, but lived there, college-like, without any want, and in good reputation with our neighbours that were Catholics, about us."—*Imp. Cons.* 77.

The queen had now lived, several years, without personal alarm from Romish hostility. Both she and the public were, however, sufficiently prepared by former plots, for any new panic. She had one more to undergo, and rarely has come forward, a lamer story, or a more absurd scheme. Edward Squire, formerly an underling in the royal stables, enlisted under Drake, upon his last expedition, and was taken prisoner, in the West Indies[1]. Thence he was sent to Seville, but by some means he got free, and returned home. He was now denounced by another Englishman from Spain, named Stanley, as engaged in a design to kill the queen. At first, he stoutly denied, but the rack extorted from him the following tale. While in a Spanish prison, Walpole, an English Jesuit, had him seized by the Inquisition, as a heretic. This new misfortune proved so intolerable, that he was tempted into a profession of Romanism, to escape from it. Walpole now told him, that his conversion would, indeed, be glorious and beneficial to him, if he would signalise it by relieving the Catholic cause, even from Essex, much more so from Elizabeth herself. The enterprise was really without either difficulty or danger. He should be furnished with a poison, such as nothing could withstand. He had only to rub it on the pommel of the queen's saddle. She must hold her hand upon this, and its venom would soon circulate fatally with her life's blood. The experiment, Squire admitted himself to have tried, and, subsequently, a similar one with Essex's chair[2]. Neither party, however, found any inconvenience. That, at least, was clear, and in gentler times, would have shielded the reputed poisoner from any extreme penalty. But his age could neither see the folly of such an attempt, nor be mollified by its failure. Being put upon his trial[1], he would admit no more than Walpole's persuasions to undertake the murder. Every thing else, he said, was mere invention, wrested from him by torture[2]. He had not even consented to the scheme, much less used any poison. He was told, however, from the bench, that his present admission fixed him with concealment of treason, and Sir Robert Cecil brought him to confess again. The stern spirit of his time could now decently take its accustomed course. He was condemned as a traitor, and soon after executed[3]. His last

---

[1] Watson thus concludes an enumeration of the Romish provocations offered in this reign, (the same that ordinary writers detail, and papal writers notice, more or less,) "If we at home, all of us, both priests and people, had possessed our souls in meekness and humility, honoured her Majesty, borne with the infirmities of the state, suffered all things, and dealt as true Catholic priests: if all of us (we say) had thus done, most assuredly, the state would have loved us, or at least, borne with us: where there is one Catholic, there should have been ten: there had been no speeches among us of racks and tortures, nor any cause to have used them; *for none were ever vexed that way simply, for that he was either priest, or catholic, but because they were suspected to have had their hands in some of the said most traitorous designments.*" (*Imp. Cons.* 89.) The late Mr. Butler spoke of Watson's works, as "highly blameable for their virulence and misrepresentations." (*Hist. Mem.* iii. 212. note.) In fact, however, Watson only confirms the representations of others, and makes admissions that existing documents abundantly justify. Nor does he generally write in an unbecoming tone. Undoubtedly, his admissions are deeply galling to Romanists, especially to such as are connected with Jesuits, or look favourably upon that order for its unquestionable services to English Popery. Watson's relations are the very reverse of those which a Romish posterity pares and varnishes for its own gratification, and for winning Protestant favour. But they are the relations of a contemporary, a zealous Romanist, and even a martyr to the Romish cause. Impatience of Jesuitic encroachment might be the main cause of his admissions; but an angry man may speak the truth, and often does, when perfect calmness would have kept it locked-up in his breast. Watson's anger is capable of great extenuation. The Jesuits, who aroused it, he viewed not only as insolent, assuming upstarts, but also as unpatriotic Englishmen, abettors of regicide, injurious to Romish credit, and provokers of nearly all the hardships that Romanists underwent.

---

[1] Cambden. 611.

[2] "Not long after he very artificially rubbed the poison upon the pommel of the Queen's saddle, pretending to be busy about something else, and crying out, *God save the Queen;* but through God's mercy, the poison took not its effect. Meanwhile, to avoid all suspicion, he listed himself under the Earl of Essex, who intended for the Azores, and went out of England a soldier in his own ship; and there he besmeared the Earl's chair with the same poison, but to as little effect. After this, he returned into England, and lived secure, and without the least apprehension, that Walpole, his confessor, would have turned informer against him; but he, being, it seems, very much nettled at the ill success of his enterprise, and suspecting, that Squire had choused him, for all his vow and engagements, bent himself wholly to

revenge; and 'tis most certain that a person was sent to England to impeach Squire for treason, in general terms." (Cambden. 611.) This *impeachment* is the strangest part of the whole story. It is likely, that Squire would pretend a conversion to Romanism, or anything else, for some temporary end; that he might talk to an English Jesuit, anxious to return home, of destroying the queen; that he might receive some encouragement from him; and might mention, without its folly being seen on either side, the scheme of poisoning the royal saddle. But that, on the failure of this ingenious device, Walpole should have marked the soldier-groom for vengeance, and sent an informer over to take away his life, is utterly incredible.

[1] Nov. 9, at Westminster. (Stowe. 787.) Dr. Lingard draws a ridiculous picture of the crown counsel, at this trial. Coke, the leader, made a very pathetic speech, until his feelings appeared too big for farther utterance, and he abruptly sat down. The junior then dwelt upon the queen's miraculous escape, "the season being hot, and the veins open to receive any malign tainture." But although such a tragic scene from an aspiring lawyer, is not above suspicion, yet Elizabeth's hold upon the national affections places it upon something higher ground than a mere piece of acting. As for the poison, the heat, and so forth, which cast an air of banter over the second speech, their time for making laughing-stocks, had not come in the sixteenth century. None seem, then, to have considered Squire's plan ridiculous, however they might have doubted its reality.

[2] "He had been five hours on the rack."—Lingard. viii. 416.

[3] Nov. 13, at Tyburn.—Stowe. 787.

protestations not only claimed entire innocence for himself, but also completely exonerated Walpole[1].

In its own vindication, the government published an account of this case. Another version soon came from Walpole's pen. This relates, that Squire misconducted himself as a prisoner of war, and was, therefore, adjudged to a confinement of two years, in a Carmelite convent. Becoming very uneasy under this restraint, he sent for his countryman, Walpole, and pretended conversion to Romanism. The Jesuit, however, doubted him, and would not interfere for his release. He then denies, not only the alleged supply of poison, but even any conversation upon the queen's assassination. Nay, he would not go so far as to give him a letter to any English Catholic. Squire, being thus completely foiled, escaped from his penitentiary, and reaching St. Lucar, obtained a passage to England[2]. The most suspicious feature in this account, is the confinement of a disorderly prisoner of war in a Carmelite convent. This looks like a link connecting him with the Inquisition, and redeeming his relations from the imputation of unmingled fiction. There can, however, be little doubt, that he was a desperate, unprincipled adventurer, with whom no man's character was safe, and whose tongue, as is not unusual with disreputable inferiors, was wholly at the command of any temporary object.

---

[1] LINGARD. *ut supra.*

[2] *Ibid.* Note GG. viii. 547. "The poison, it was said, was contained in a double bladder, which Squire was to prick with a pin, and then to press on the pommel of the saddle. The Queen would, undoubtedly, touch it with her hand, and afterwards, move her hand to her mouth or nose. In either case, death must ensue; as the poison was of so subtle and penetrating a nature, that it would certainly reach either her lungs, or stomach." Dr. Lingard thus introduces these sentences: "If Titus Oates had never existed, the history of this ridiculous plot would suffice to shew, how easily the most absurd fictions obtain credit, when the public mind is under the influence of religious prejudice." This is not a happy illustration. It is now known, that there was really a Popish plot, and that the king was at the bottom of it, when Oates earned his infamous distinction. Nor probably, if some hints of the truth had not transpired, would that miscreant have ever been tempted into his atrocious romances. Watson, writing soon after the event, makes no doubt of Squire's guilt: saying, "Hereunto we may add, the late villainous attempt of Edward Squire, animated and drawn thereunto by Walpole, that pernicious Jesuit." (*Imp. Cons.* 81.) Dr. Lingard says, "Indeed, so little was Walpole known either to Squire, or to Stanley, the pretended messenger, that neither of them could inform the council of his Christian name.

However little to Romish discredit, Squire's case may really be, no similar advantage is claimable from the next papal appearance in English affairs. Hippolytus Aldobrandini, now pope, under the name of Clement VIII., had all that restless anxiety to recover England, which appeared like an heir-loom in the Vatican. Nor did he think his chance unpromising of exchanging dreams and longings, for substantial showers of gold. His immediate predecessors had been so completely foiled, that a high estimate of Elizabeth long prevailed at Rome, and acted like an unseasonable frost, when hope was in the spring. But the watchful, vigorous rule, which had shamed both Italy and Spain, depended now on a declining aged life. Clement eagerly dwelt upon this cheering prospect. He spoke of Elizabeth as "an old woman without a husband, or a certain successor[1]," and expressed even the flattering hope of living to see another vassal on the English throne, goading a reluctant people to enrich the

---

They were compelled to guess at it, and in the indictment and pleadings, called him William, instead of Richard." It appears from Foulis, that there were three brothers of this family, which was of Norfolk, Henry, Michael, and Richard, all Jesuits. (*Rom. Treas.* 357.) William, therefore, was not a lucky guess. Men like Squire and Stanley, were not likely to have been accurate upon such a subject. They, probably, knew the party only as Father Walpole.

[1] Butler. *Hist. Mem.* i. 271.

head-quarters of superstition[1]. As usual, he marked Ireland for his lever. Hugh O'Neil, no longer condescending to be called Earl of Tyrone, but rather affecting the prince of his native island, was now in very formidable strength[2]. He seemed, indeed, at one time, far from unlikely to shake off the superiority of England[3]. But his exertions had owed much of their success to assistance from Irish chieftains of English origin. These became aware, that decisive victory would soon lay them defenceless before massacre and confiscation. They were but Saxons or Normans after all, useful in a struggle, but intrusive occupants of other men's estates, on a satisfactory settlement. Hence their awakening fears were fast converting them from active partisans of the aboriginal Irish, into allies of their own English brethren[4]. Their former friends, yet needing aid, urgently, but vainly, deprecated such desertions to the enemy's camp[5]. The queen, they were reminded, was deprived by Rome, for heresy, and as her offence had never been forsaken, its penalty remained in force[1]. The Anglo-Irish, however, knew their countrymen of unmixed blood, to reckon tenaciously upon recovering for themselves every acre that conquest had made another's prize. Hence they could clearly see the fallacy of disputing a royal title upon grounds merely theological. While their field of vision was thus inconveniently extending, Clement complimented O'Neil with a plume of feathers, consecrated by himself. This latter distinction was, of course, attainable on any day. Not so, probably, the plume itself. A phœnix had supplied it, and even a pope must be supposed incapable only of getting at some lucky time a bird so proverbially rare[2]. Unquestionably, the capture was highly opportune. The destined renovator of a fallen church, fitly wore a helmet plumed with phœnix-feathers.

---

[1] "Neither you, or I," (said Clement to Cardinal d'Ossat,) "are so old, but that we may yet behold her subdued. England has been conquered often, and may be conquered again."—BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* i. 272.

[2] "On the death of Tyrlough Lynnogh, he proclaimed himself the O'Nial, and was considered by his countrymen as the Irish sovereign of Ulster." (LINGARD. viii. 430.) It became usual among his countrymen to speak of him as *the prince.*—PHELAN'S *History of the Policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland.* Lond. 1827. p. 183.

[3] After the defeat of Sir Henry Bagnal, in the battle of Blackwater, in Tyrone, Aug. 14, 1598.—LINGARD. viii. 432. PHELAN. 178.

[4] "It is probable, that the connection of these islands would have been now dissolved, had not the rebel lords of English descent begun to be alarmed at the extent of their own success. Whether Ireland was to become an independent kingdom under O'Neil, or, as was more likely, and more agreeable to the views of Rome and the prelates, be annexed to the Spanish monarchy, the revolution threatened to bring with it the extirpation of the English colonists. The apprehension of such a result had moved the wary lords of the pale, though in opposition to the government, to abstain from rebellion."—PHELAN. 181.

[5] "Oh, ignorant, foolish, and abandoned men, (exclaims the

---

indignant O'Sullivan,) ye Anglo-Irish priests of the English faction, how will you ever expiate this atrocious guilt? Can you be of a spirit purely and entirely Catholic? Let the wise reader judge. As for myself, I cannot hold for sound or Catholic doctrine, a notion so fatal to the salvation of souls and the propagation of the faith, as that Catholics may fight against Catholics in the cause of heresy."—PHELAN. 182.

[1] "Such as were sworn to be faithful unto her," (the queen,) "were by his Holiness absolved from performance hereof, seeing she is, by a declaration of excommunication, pronounced a heretic; neither is there any revocation of the excommunication, as some Catholics do most falsely, for particular affection, surmise: for the sentence was in the beginning given for heresy, and for continued heresy the same was continued."—Proclamation of O'Neil from Duneveag. Nov. 15, 1599. *Ibid.* 185.

[2] Clement sent O'Neil "a plume, hallowed by his own apostolical benediction, and as the Pontiff gravely declared, and his word was not questioned by the discreet aspirant, formed of the feathers of a genuine phœnix, the apt symbol of a reviving church and state: but the present was conveyed by a Spanish ecclesiastic, upon whom, as a pledge of the destiny which awaited the regenerated country, his Holiness had conferred the archbishopric of Dublin."—*Ibid.* 188.

It might soothe him, too, under disappointment. He meant a sovereignty for his requital. Clement meant him to conquer one for Spain. The wondrous plume was quickly followed by a bull of indulgence, promising to insurgents against Elizabeth, all such spiritual benefits as popes had usually given to those who war with Turks, or set out upon crusades to Palestine[1]. The laugh of a Roman clerk in writing such a promise, might have been found, here and there, infectious by an Irish chieftain, as he read, or heard it. But his followers, though among the archest of mankind, would receive it all in sober earnest. The Roman parchment could not fail of adding fire and venom to their inveterate fanaticism, ignorance, and violence. Its transmission to Ireland was, therefore, another papal crime.

With inferior guilt, because with less likelihood of provoking bloodshed and confusion, Clement made secret preparations for influencing the English succession. His guide was the book, known as Doleman's, and said to have been published by Spanish instigation. Persons, the editor, and part author, reduces the probable successors of Elizabeth to the kings of Spain and Scotland, and the Lady Arabella Stuart. The first, through Portugal, he makes lineal heir of the House of Lancaster. The last two represented Margaret, elder daughter of Henry VII.[2] Of them, James, though direct heir, had long been marked for exclusion as a heretic and an alien. The Spanish family was now abandoned, Clement considering it a desperate speculation, from the probability of English opposition[1]. Only Arabella remained, and no subject was fitter for sanguine calculation, than a young, unmarried female. A trustworthy husband for her might be found at Parma. The duke, indeed, had unluckily a wife already; but his brother was a cardinal, and, of course, without one. He was to be set free from the yoke of empurpled celibacy, and sent into England, under papal patronage, a bridegroom for Arabella[2]. To facilitate his courtship, two briefs regularly, but clandestinely, issued from the Vatican. One was to the Romish priesthood in England, the other to the nobility and gentry. Both enjoined resistance to any new sovereign, however qualified by blood, who would not bind himself to the Romish cause[3]. These instruments were sent to Garnet, pro-

---

[1] "Hugoni Duci, ejusque exercitus militibus, universis et singulis, si vere pœnitentes, et confessi, ac etiam si fieri poterit, sacra Communione refecti fueritis, plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum veniam, et remissionem, ac eandem quæ proficiscentibus ad bellum contra Turcas, et ad recuperationem Terræ sanctæ per Romanos pontifices concedi solita est, misericorditer in Domino concedimus. Dat. Rom. ap. S. Pet. sub annulo Piscatoris, 18 Ap. 1600."—Collier. *Records.* xcvii. ii. 102.

[2] Arabella Stuart was only child of Charles Stuart, earl of

---

Lennox, by Elizabeth, daughter of Sir William Cavendish; this Charles was younger son of Matthew Stuart, earl of Lennox, and Regent of Scotland, by Margaret, daughter of Archibald Douglas, earl of Angus, being his only issue from Margaret, elder daughter of Henry VII., to whom he was second husband. The Lady Arabella was thought a secret Romanist.

[1] "To the Spanish line the Pope supposed the English would never submit." (BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* i. 271.) "As long as she" (the *Infanta*) "was at liberty to marry either the king of Scots, or an English nobleman, it was hoped that the nation might be induced to admit her claim: but from the moment of her union with Archduke Albert, the most sanguine of her adherents began to despond. After the death of Cardinal Allen, in 1594, Persons left the court of Spain to reside at Rome. He now professed to limit his views to the succession of a Catholic sovereign: who that sovereign might be, was not for him to determine: it was a question which he left to the decision of the pontiff, the neighbouring princes, and the people of England."—LINGARD. viii. 478.

[2] "It was proposed that she should marry the Cardinal Farnese, who could trace his descent from John of Ghent; and that all Catholics should be exhorted to support their united pretensions." —*Ibid.*

[3] "On the trial of Father Garnet, Sir Edward Coke represented them as enjoining the Catholics,

vincial of the Jesuits. By him they were said to have been very discreetly kept, hardly any being indulged with a sight of them. On James's accession, he declared himself to have burnt them[1]. These things might be so: but when popes prepare such writings, and monastic superiors take them in, it is mere folly to ask respect or confidence for either.

Irish difficulties compelled the queen to call her last

---

not to admit any person, how near soever upon the line to the throne, after the queen's death, unless such person would not only tolerate the Catholic religion, but promote it to the utmost of his power; and engage himself by oath, according to the custom of his ancestors, for that purpose. That such were the contents of the briefs, Father Garnet did not deny." (BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* i. 275.) "When this visionary scheme" (about Arabella and Farnese) "was suggested to Clement VIII., he appeared to entertain it with pleasure; but was careful not to commit himself by any public avowal of his sentiments. He signed, indeed, two breves, addressed to the English nobility and clergy. But in them he mentioned no name. He merely exhorted the Catholics to refuse their aid to every claimant who would not promise to support the ancient worship, and to take the oath which had formerly been taken by the Catholic monarchs." (LINGARD. *ut supra.*) The fact is, that Clement was enamoured of this project, which was regularly communicated to Henry IV. Cardinal d'Ossat, through whom the communication passed, reasoned with the pope on the futility of his design, and Henry did the same. (BUTLER. *ut supra.*) As for "support of the ancient worship," Edward and Elizabeth had notoriously continued "the ancient worship," merely translating it, and expunging its less ancient parts. That any oath had ever been taken by an English king to maintain the religion established at Trent, remains to be proved.

[1] "These instruments were forwarded to the nuncio at Brussels, and through him to Garnet, the superior of the Jesuits, with an injunction to keep them secret till the death of Elizabeth. Garnet obeyed; and on the accession of the king of Scots, prudently committed them to the flames." (LINGARD. *ut supra.*) "He admitted that they were transmitted to him, but he alleged in his defence, that he kept them secret, shewed them to very few, and soon after the accession of James, committed them to the flames. He also alleged, that both the pope and the superiors of his order earnestly recommended to the Catholics to bear their sufferings with patience, and to abstain from violence of every kind."—BUTLER. *ut supra.*

parliament[1]. She had found the sister-island a constant source of disquietude and financial embarrassment. It had driven her to seek pecuniary relief even by selling some of the crown lands[2]. But no ordinary means of supply sufficed for meeting such a drain. As a Spanish force, however, was actually in the country, to retire from the contest was impossible[3]. The Commons, fully aware of pressing exigences, and fired by zeal for Protestantism, responded liberally to the ministerial appeals. During their session, were some indications of that puritanical spirit which had leavened all Elizabeth's former parliaments. The old grievance of pluralities was again brought forward. It was met, as usual, by the obvious answer, that a great majority of benefices afforded no tolerable maintenance; and that hence, prohibition of a second church must close the clerical profession against all best fitted to adorn it[4]. Other objectors fastened upon episcopal courts, which had fallen upon a growing unpopularity. It is probable, that complaints of them were not without reason, for the archbishop took notice of the cry, and recommended regulations to reduce its force[5]. A bill was also brought in, to impose a fine of twelve-pence, recoverable by distress under warrant from an ordinary magistrate, upon voluntary absence from church. This was opposed as unnecessary, there being already a statutable penalty of twenty pounds a month for such default. It was also stamped as a measure that would swarm the houses of magistrates with common informers. The bill, however, was very near passing the Lower House, being lost by a single vote, which, it was urged, the speaker, known to be favourable, might supply[1]. The question was then put as to his right of voting, and decided negatively. The other measures regarding religion, were dropped by royal influence[2].

---

[1] Oct. 27, 1601.

[2] Sir Robert Cecil in the House of Commons, Nov. 3.—HEYWOOD TOWNSEND's *Historical Collections.* 184.

[3] "He" (the king of Spain) "hath put an army into Ireland, the number four thousand, under the conduct of a valiant, expert, and hardy captain, who chooseth rather than to return to his own country without any famous enterprise, to live and die in this service."—*Ut supra.*

[4] Dr. James said that there were only six hundred parochial benefices in England, affording competent maintenance to the incumbents.—TOWNSEND. 218.

[5] In Convocation, Dec. 21.—STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 446.

While parliament sate, a proclamation was issued, suggested by the feud between the Jesuits and Romish seculars[3]. Public attention had been fixed upon this, during a considerable time; and Richard Bancroft, so well known in the Puritan controvery, now bishop of London, thought of turning it, with concurrence of the council, to some good account. He took the discontented seculars under his protection, and seems to have supplied means of advocating their case in print, together with facilities for carrying it to Rome[4]. Some of the Puritans were scandalised by this patronage of Popery[1]. But a design had evidently been formed to separate, if possible, Romish principles and papal politics. The former were worthy of respect, not so the latter. The proclamation was, therefore, strictly justified in drawing a broad line of distinction between the two parties. It notices their dissensions, gives qualified commendation to the majority of the seculars, but condemns the Jesuits, with such of the seculars as were of their party[2]. The junction of these two is branded as a *combination*; every member of

---

[1] TOWNSEND. 321.

[2] STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 445. Archbishop Whitgift drew up a series of reasons for the continuance of pluralities, for the queen's information. Collier has printed it from a Lambeth MS.—*Eccl. Hist.* ii. 666.

[3] Nov. 5, 1601.—BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* i. 261.

[4] "This probably was done, partly out of a design to keep up the division, and partly to encourage the honester side." (COLLIER. ii. 664.) In the passports for Rome, given to the agents for the seculars, by Bancroft's means, they were said to have been banished. It is the just observation of Winwood, that "which party soever shall gain, the common cause must needs lose, whose nakedness shall be discovered, and shewn displayed to the view of the world." (LINGARD. viii. 482. note.) The extent of Bancroft's interference may have been overrated. An advocate for the seculars says, "Neither were these bookes printed *by secret favour and intelligence with the Councel and Bishop of London.*"—"This fellow his affirmation that Mr. Bluet had conference with the Bishop of London, Councel, and Queene herselfe, for the printing of these *Libels* (as he termeth them), said to be printed at Roane, is most

---

false. For these bookes were not printed by any such meanes, but at the charge of the priests, and in most secret manner."—*A Reply to a notorious Libell*, &c. 51. 332.

[1] "And Cecil deemed it necessary to furnish public and unequivocal proof of his orthodoxy. A proclamation was issued in the name of Elizabeth." (LINGARD. viii. 482.) A more charitable mode of accounting for the proclamation of Nov. 5, and, seemingly, more reasonable too, may be found in the natural desire to separate religious Romanists from political. To the former, Elizabeth appears never to have been really hostile, although neither her position, nor the principles of her time, would allow an open toleration.

[2] "The former" (Jesuits) "she pronounces traitors without any exception: the latter" (seculars), "though less guilty, are disobedient and disloyal subjects, who, under the vizard of a pretended conscience, steal away the hearts of the simple and common people. She then complains, that, in consequence of her clemency to both these classes of men, they even *adventured to walk the streets at noon-day*, and carried themselves so as to breed a suspicion, that she proposed to grant a toleration of two religions, though God knew that she was ignorant of any such imagination, and that no one had ever ventured to suggest it to her. In conclusion, she commands all Jesuits, and all priests, their adherents, to quit the kingdom within thirty days, and all others, their opponents, within three months, under the peril of suffering the penalties enjoined by law against persons who had received ordination by authority of the bishop of Rome. The proclamation was followed by the establishment of a new commission for the sole purpose of banishing the Catholic clergymen." (LINGARD. viii. 483.) Might it not have had another purpose; *viz.*, that of authorizing the stay of such priests as acknowledged allegiance, who are specially excepted by the proclamation? Romish enquirers into English history will find this exception expressly mentioned by Mr. Butler, (*Hist. Mem.* i. 202,) and it is of importance for an accurate understanding of the case.

which is ordered out of the realm within a definite period, except any such as should come forward and make a formal profession of allegiance. To them was opened a prospect of indulgence. Thus religious Romanism had an intelligible promise of connivance; political could expect only to be crushed, if possible.

Eagerly was this opening hailed among priests duly alive to their spiritual character. They needed no longer to be mixed up with a confused mass of civil firebrands. They might stand forth, honourably distinguished as patriotic Englishmen, and conscientious ministers. Thirteen members of the Romish priesthood promptly took this creditable position. They presented a protestation of allegiance[1], admitting the queen's authority to be identical with that vested in any of her predecessors. This admission is expressly grounded on God's word, which exacted from them the same unreserved civil obedience that it did from Protestants. Acknowledging and condemning the conspiracies and expeditions to force Romanism upon England and Ireland, they declare a determination to resist all such, from whatever potentate, prelate, or prince, they may originate. Any knowledge of such guilty enterprises they promise to reveal, as also to persuade, so far as possible, all of their religion to do the same. Any papal excommunication in furtherance of such attempts, they declare of no force over the conscience, and they pledge themselves to disregard it. The document is closed by a profession of belief, that the papal see is derived from St. Peter, and possessed of all the authority given by Christ to that apostle, but of no more[2].

[1] Dated Jan. 31, 1602.

[2] "Much, indeed, it is to be be lamented, that it was not generally signed by all the Catholic clergy and laity of England."—BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* i. 268.

The mere agitators were disgusted and enraged by this protestation. It was, at once, pronounced an "officious obtrusion." The subscribers pleaded, in reply, Elizabeth's proclamation. It was condemned, for charging Romanists with conspiracies and forcible attempts, which skilful tacticians usually denied, or explained away. The northern rebellion, Babington and others, were brought forward in its justification[1]. But violent partisans are seldom put down by a dry array of facts. The thirteen priests, accordingly, had not only to undergo the reproaches of their political brethren at home. Their protestation was warmly canvassed abroad, and the divines of Louvaine passed a censure upon it. Men of any sense or character could not answer a call for such a service with any great severity. The Flemish doctors, accordingly, are very cautious in dealing with this document, so honourable to English Romanism[2]. If it had been generally adopted by persons of that persuasion, their character as Christians would have been greatly benefited. Probably, however, their schism would have gradually died away. Religious bodies rarely long continue proof against the silent, ceaseless attrition of a rival establishment, unless passion and interest keep-up the separation.

---

[1] BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* i. 267.

[2] "They mention that the point submitted to them wholly turned on the question, whether the pope hath, or hath not, an indirect power in temporals. They assert that the affirmative of the proposition is certain; that the negative of it is false; but not contrary to faith, and contrary only to the common opinion. That the thirteen priests had not, by signing the declaration of allegiance, rendered themselves ineligible to offices, or improper to hold them. That the opinion expressed by them was tolerated in France; that the pope had conferred ecclesiastical dignities upon some who maintained it; and that several fathers of the society of Jesus, who had openly professed it, had been recognised by the other fathers of their order.—Its signature by Mr. Bishop, and his activity in procuring signatures, did not prevent the see of Rome from appointing him her vicar-apostolic, with ordinary jurisdistion over the Catholics in England and Scotland." Bishop, afterwards consecrated bishop of Chalcedon, framed the protestation. "Two of the other priests by whom it was signed, Roger Cadwallader and Robert Drury, afterwards suffered death under the penal code of Elizabeth."—BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* i. 267. 268.

The dissension that raged among their body, was attributed by some of the Romish clergy, to want of regular superiors. This was unfelt in Allen's time, but since his death, unanimity seemed hopeless. If they lived, however, like their brethren elsewhere, under episcopal authority, rising ill humours might be promptly repressed. A petition, accordingly, was preferred, for the appointment of bishops. When this desire first came under discussion, at Rome, Persons thought its gratification expedient. But he soon changed his opinion. A single superior was, however, appointed, under a cardinal's letter, with authority over all Britain[1], in the person of George Blackwell, formerly of Trinity College, Oxford, who was to bear the title of *archpriest*[2]. By this irregular appointment, the breach was widened. The seculars denied its validity, until formally sanctioned by the pope. They ought, besides, to have been consulted, but of this there was hardly an appearance[3]. Blackwell himself was the mere creature of Garnet, provincial of the Jesuits; a tool, therefore, of their enemies, rather than an impartial umpire[1]. Hence they transmitted an appeal against him to the papal court[2]. Clement would not remove him, but he found his opponents able to justify their complaints. The archpriest was, accordingly, reprimanded, and forbidden either to ask, or receive advice, upon official questions, from Garnet, or any other Jesuit[3].

---

[1] *A Reply to a Libell*, &c. 369. 189.

[2] Cambden. 649. "It is plain, from the subsequent conduct of Clement, that the Pontiff sought only to put an end to the dissensions among the missionaries: but the projectors of the measure had in view a great political object. They had persuaded themselves, that by subjecting all the secular priests to the government of a single superior attached to their party, they should be able, at the death of the Queen, to employ the influence of the whole body in support of a favourite candidate for the crown."—Lingard. viii. 481.

[3] *A Reply to a Libell*, &c. 353. 116.

To the queen, these movements really were of very little importance. When the strife began, she was near the age ordinarily bounding human life, and she did not pass it. Her strength, for some time, was visibly declining, and a new year opened, with every indication that much of it could hardly be allowed her. In meeting death, she displayed none of her habitual dignity. She was gloomy and silent. Sectarian enmity dwelt upon this melancholy picture, as painting faculties benumbed by conscience[4]. Nor is it likely, that Elizabeth, any more than most persons, (especially in high and trying situations,) could face an immediate summons to her great account, without uneasiness. Under such a prospect, almost every serious mind, sorrowfully falls upon self-accusation. Torpor and dejection may, however, come entirely from disease. Death's icy fingers often operate lethargically: the spirits cannot mount; every sinew is hopelessly unbraced. Happily, the queen, though averse from medicine, and even food, though ever drowsy yet incapable of sleep, was quite alive to religious duties[1]. The archbishop, with his brethren in attendance.

---

[1] "He received secret instructions to consult the provincial of the Jesuits in England on all points of particular importance." (LINGARD. *ut supra.*) The grounds alleged for this injunction, were Garnet's experience in English affairs, and his personal weight with the Romish body. (*A Reply to a Libell*, &c. 174.) The latter was, most probably, chiefly thought of. It is plain, that lay Romanists had fallen pretty completely under Jesuitic influence.

[2] "He first stripped them of their *faculties* (as they are termed) and not long after, upon their appeal to the Pope, procured a breve for declaring them schismatics and heretics. But they got clear of this censure, and that by the verdict of the whole university of Paris."—CAMBDEN. *ut supra.*

[3] LINGARD. viii. 482. The pope's instructions of Oct. 5, 1602, expressly restrain Blackwell from all power over priests, not educated in the seminaries, and over the laity. In revoking the instructions, originally given through Cardinal Cajetan, for consultation with Garnet, they go upon the ground of giving no new occasion for discord and contention.—COLLIER. *Records.* XCVIII. ii. 103.

[4] A contemporary account, cited by Miss Aikin, from NICHOLS'S *Progresses*, says, "No doubt you will hear her Majesty's sickness, and manner of death, diversely reported; for even here the Papists do tell strange stories, as utterly

---

void of truth, as of all civil honesty and humanity." (*Memoirs of the Court of Queen Elizabeth.* ii. 496.) "The gloom and mental agony, in which the last days of *her*, by whose ministers these persecutions of the Catholics were devised, have been recorded by almost all her historians, but accounted-for satisfactorily by none. The story of the Earl of Essex, the Countess of Nottingham and the ring, have been elevated to history by the pen of Hume: the age of Elizabeth, for she was, at this time, in her seventieth year, would appear an insuperable objection to its truth, if other circumstances of her life did not prove, that, even at this period, she was susceptible of romantic fondness. It is, however, evident, that these circumstances, without being the sole cause of the Queen's distress, might lead her to retrospective meditations; and that the illusions of vanity, pleasure, passion, and ambition, then ceasing to operate, she might strongly feel, that she stood on the verge of eternity, and was soon to render to God, who commanded us to love our neighbour as ourselves, an account of all that had been done to secure her the honours and the power, which she was soon to quit for ever. That her woe arose from this cause, the dismal circumstances related of it, render as probable as any, which has yet been assigned."—BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* iii. 264.

[1] Anonymous contemporary Latin letter to Edm. Lambert, seemingly from a physician in attendance. (STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 466.) "She would admit of no discourse, unless with the Archbishop of Canterbury, who joined with her in prayer and other devotions, which she performed with great fervency till her speech left her, and then she was very attentive to his Grace, while he prayed with her." (CAMBDEN. 653.) "Though by reason of her melancholy disease, she was impatient of others' speeches with her, yet was she well pleased to hear the Archbishop, the then Bishops of London and Chichester, and the now Bishop of Worcester, with some other divines, give her comfort and counsel to prepare herself

found her devout and humble. Even, during her last three days, when speech had fled, she gave signs of a gratifying interest in the offices of piety. Understanding left her only with life[1]. Sluggish depression, therefore, seems to have flowed merely from the snapping of a cord that bound her to the earth. Afterwards, without a powerful effort, she could not fix attention upon anything external. Hence it was alike reasonable and becoming to decline such exertion, unless demanded by another world. Any other call, a dying *invalid* might be excused for meeting, and even with some degree of waywardness.

As a temporal ruler, Elizabeth's fame is perfectly established[2]. Contemporaries admired and feared her.

---

to God-ward, and most devoutly prayed with them, making signs and tokens unto her last remembrance of the sweet comfort which she took in their presence, especially when towards her end, they put her in mind of the unspeakable joys she was now going unto." (PAULE'S *Whitgift*. 95.) "Her religion was, like that of most princes, a thing of policy and form. Protestant in name, but Papist in spirit, she attended to the ceremonial parts of worship, but was utterly destitute of that reverence for the Deity, without which external services cannot be pleasing in His sight." (PRICE. i. 441.) The knowledge of Elizabeth's heart, required by the penning of this passage, is hardly reconcileable with the personal knowledge to which we owe the former passages.

[1] She died March 24, 1603.

[2] "In the judgement of her contemporaries, and that judgement has been ratified by the consent of posterity, Elizabeth was numbered among the greatest and most fortunate of our princes. The tranquillity which, during a reign of nearly half a century, she maintained within her dominions, while the neighbouring kingdoms were convulsed with intestine dissensions, was taken as a proof of the wisdom or the vigour of her government: and her successful resistance against the Spanish monarch, the many injuries which she inflicted on that lord of so many kingdoms, and the spirit displayed by her fleets and armies, in expeditions to France and the Netherlands, to Spain, to the West, and even the East Indies, served to give to the world an exalted notion of her military and naval power. When she came to the throne, England ranked only among the secondary kingdoms; before her death, it had risen to a level with the first nations in Europe." (LINGARD. viii. 490.) This is accounted-for in two ways: first,

Posterity yet pays traditionary homage to her capacity for government. She proved, indeed, permanently a national benefactress. Never had wealth and civilisation made ground so rapidly and surely, as during her long and auspicious reign. It is true, that subsequent acquisitions, both intellectual and material, have thrown a shade over the *good queen's* days. Contrasted with recent periods, they may seem even poor, and semi-barbarous. Yet stars poured a flood of light on them, which defies eclipse. The era of Shakspeare, Spenser, Hooker, and Bacon, must always rank among the proudest. Of internal prosperity, too, there are numerous evidences remaining. So thickly did splendid mansions rise, while England gladly owned obedience to the last and most illustrious Tudor, that *Elizabethan* is a standing term of palatial architecture[1]. To diplomatic skill, and vigorous internal policy, the successful issue of many threatening struggles, bears unanswerable testimony. No sovereign, it is true, was ever better served. But in this, is rather evidence of fitness for the throne, than of any extraordinary good-fortune. Inferior minds have neither power

---

by "that spirit of commercial enterprise which had revived in the reign of Mary, and had been carefully fostered in that of Elizabeth:" secondly, by "the foreign policy adopted by the ministers; a policy, indeed, which it may be difficult to reconcile with honesty and good faith, but which, in the result, proved eminently successful." The "policy" in question, is that of sowing dissensions in foreign states. So that England rose in the scale of nations, under Elizabeth, because she followed Mary as to commerce, and employed ministers who were hardly honest.

[1] "There was never the like number of fair and stately houses as have been built and set up from the ground since her Majesty's reign; insomuch, that there have been reckoned in one shire, that is not great, to the number of thirty-three, which have all been new built within that time; and whereof the meanest was never built for two thousand pounds."—Bacon. *Observations on a Libel.* Works. iii. 52.

to discern competence, nor honesty to seek it, nor even to use it, if thrust upon them without gilded trappings, and with an independent air. Vanity, prejudice, interest, and indulgence, form an horizon quite wide enough for petty selfishness, and stultified *hauteur*. Leicester and Essex, undoubtedly, lowered Elizabeth within reach of ordinary qualities. The former, though he might be popularly meted with a favourite's measure, was really but little worthy of any extraordinary partiality. Nor was the latter, probably, at all above the average of royal minions. Her intimacy with Leicester naturally provoked unworthy reflections, and perhaps even suspicions, in political opponents, exasperated by sectarian rancour: an annoyance not altogether unjustly requiting blameable weakness[1]. Of criminality, there is no evidence, nay more, no substantial appearance. Guilt, fiercely and perseveringly assailed, could hardly have been so fortunate. Elizabeth really seems chargeable with nothing worse than personal vanity, incautious levity, and an excessive, injudicious display of the deeper feelings inherent in human nature. At one age, conjugal affections prevail, at another, parental. The former centred in Leicester, the latter in Essex. The queen's yearning for these natural relations, was, besides, discovered in her antipathy to the marriages of all about her. This continually occasioned bursts of spiteful envy, which would be ridiculous and hateful, if it were not pitiable. An over-done, gaudy wardrobe finds another resting-point for envy and detraction in the character of this illustrious princess. But human minds, especially female, are seldom quite above a tinsel strut. It would spread an air of littleness much more widely than it actually does, did not necessity, or prudence, or raillery, or, it may be, avarice, come to the rescue. Royal opulence has no such protection. Princes also, as public gazing-stocks, require an attention to appearance, needless, and even ridiculous, in persons less observed. This call of station evidently acted upon the queen. In private, her apparel was ordinarily such as a masculine understanding would select[1].

---

[1] "It was not long before her familiarity with Dudley provoked dishonourable reports. At first, they gave her pain: but her feelings were soon blunted by passion: in the face of the whole court she assigned to her supposed paramour an apartment contiguous to her own bed-chamber: and by this indecent act, proved that she was become regardless of her character, and callous to every sense of shame." (LINGARD. viii. 500.) What shall be said of the Romish historian? His authority is Alvarez de Quadra, bishop of Aquila, the meddling Spanish ambassador, who acted as if papal nuncio, and who died in 1563. Spanish authority may also be found for the capture of Drake, and great advantages gained *by* the Invincible *Armada*, but inasmuch as Drake did not come to light, in Spain, and many substantial proofs of advantages gained *over* the *Armada*, gladdened the eyes of Englishmen, their government was bold enough to print a translation of Philip's accounts, with a running commentary, under the title of *A Packe of Spanish Lyes, sent abroad in the World; first printed in Spaine, in the Spanish Tongue, and translated out of the originall*, &c. A reprint from the tract of 1588, may be seen in the *Harleian Miscellany*. iii. 368.

"Some lady always slept in her chamber," (the queen's) "and besides her guards, there was always a gentleman of good quality, and some others, up in the next chamber, to wake her, if any thing extraordinary happened."—MISS AIKIN's *Elizabeth*. ii. 501.

As temporal head of the Church, Elizabeth has ever been very differently estimated. Many would place her among the worst of persecutors. Even adherents to the principles which she established, allow her patronage of them to have been occasionally like a step-mother's. The encumbrances to which she succeeded, with her patriotic determination to clear them off; the heavy drains upon her, especially from Ireland, and the Netherlands; the difficulty of raising taxes, and her unwillingness to face it; baffled all her parsimonious calculations. To keep the exchequer full, she found impossible. She was, therefore, easily tempted into extending to the secular clergy, that pillaging policy, which had crushed the regulars, under her father. The revenues of a well-endowed bishopric were found so very useful, that she could not bear to fill-it up. Even when duty overcame reluctance, there were generally exchanges insisted upon, to make the Church permanently suffer[1]. In other points, the queen conferred lasting obligations upon the national religion. It was greatly to the credit of her sense and firmness, that she restored her brother's ecclesiastical system, instead of following the exiles into some continental novelties. Nor was anything more admirable than the tenacity with which opinions, once deliberately formed, were maintained. So violent occasionally was puritanical clamour, that a short-sighted politician might have been tempted into concession. The cry was abetted by both Leicester and Essex. It was favoured, more or less, by the wise councillors, to whom she justly deferred, Cecil, Walsingham, Knollys, and Mildmay. Its hopes were even kept in vigour by surreptitious mutilations of established religious formularies. But Elizabeth really never gave the smallest way. The two archbishops, Parker and Whitgift, kept her steady to the impregnable ground of Catholicity, so happily chosen by England at the Reformation. Hence artifice, importunity, menace, treachery, embarrassment, could never seduce her, either into the semi-Paganism of Rome, or the democratic innovations of Geneva. The mode of resistance, might be cruel and mistaken: but probably, neither the queen, nor her advisers, had any such suspicion. They met religious difficulties, when admitting connivance no longer, in the same stern, arbitrary, unfeeling temper, that was aroused by opposition and offence of every other kind. The darkest stains upon Elizabeth's administration belong, therefore, to the age, rather than to herself. If more enlightened, humanised views had come under her sagacious observation, there is no probability, that she would have persisted in withstanding them. Power, she loved, of course, like human beings generally, and all are liable to abuse it. But her disposition was naturally kind, and her lofty firmness never degenerated into vulgar, impolitic obstinacy[1]. To brand her, then, as a despot, and a persecutor, is hardly more reasonable, than to ridicule her for enduring coarse manners, and rude accommodations. A modern gentleman would be as impatient of her palace, as a modern sectary, or politician, is of her government.

---

[1] "She loved a prudent and moderate habit in her private apartment and conversation with her own servants; but when she appeared in public she was ever richly adorned with the most valuable clothes; set off again with much gold and jewels of inestimable value; and on such occasions, she ever wore high shoes, that she might seem taller than indeed she was."—Miss Aikin's *Elizabeth*. ii. 501.

---

[1] "She drew back the patrimony of the Church restored by her sister Mary, and reached somewhat unkindly into the remainder. To give an instance or two farther of the depredations during this reign: the bishopric of Ely, after Cox's death, was kept vacant near twenty years, and the people almost left *like sheep without a shepherd*. 'Tis said, the ejected king of Portugal was subsisted with the rents. And when the see was filled, the next successor, Heaton, found most of the manors wrested from it. Sir John Harrington confesses this kind of management was reckoned one of the blemishes of her reign. The taking away of the Bishops' lands, and returning the lamentable exchange of impropriations, was a great blow to the Church. For not to mention these impropriations were part of the consecrated revenues; not to mention the exchange was far short of an equivalent; not to mention this, the forcing the bishops to subsist on these parochial endowments, put them out of a capacity of relieving the poor vicars, which, in many places, are very despicably provided-for."—COLLIER. ii. 669.

---

[1] This was remarkably shewn by her ready abandonment of some oppressive monopolies, complained-of in her last Parliament. Her successor shewed equal good sense and good taste in saying, *That she exceeded every sovereign, since Augustus, in felicity and prudence of administration.*—CAMBDEN. 653.

When life was closing, Elizabeth overcame her habitual reserve upon the succession: acknowledging the direct heir, James of Scotland[1]. This was, no doubt, some advantage to him: but his claims had been already, generally, and rather indecently admitted. Selfish calculators, both about the court, and elsewhere, no sooner saw the queen's rapid decline, than they made overtures to the rising sun of power and patronage[2]. The dying sovereign was far from unaware of these mortifying transfers, and they are mentioned among reasons for the melancholy that clouded her parting hours[3]. To the expectant monarch, besides being satisfactory, they were evidences that his inheritance would be peaceably conceded. Nor did any untoward appearance mar the pleasing anticipation. James found none of those difficulties that had long been apprehended from the parliamentary powers acquired by Henry VIII. He proceeded southwards, under as full recognition from every quarter, as if he had been hitherto Prince of Wales.

On his way, the puritanical party made a strenuous effort to gain him over. Its recent inactivity was nothing else than a truce, or breathing-space: energy and ambition being really unimpaired. It had, of late, chiefly shown vitality to the nation at large, by moving for *prohibitions* in the common-law courts[1]. Having failed of studding the country thickly with judicatures of its own, it seized every opportunity to defy those of the bishops. Whitgift was extremely displeased by such interference with ecclesiastical authority[2]. But he found no remedy.

---

[1] "I would have a king (said she) to succeed me, and who should that be, but the king of Scotland?" —CAMBDEN. 653.

[2] "'Tis hardly credible with how forward a zeal, all ranks and conditions of men, Puritans, Papists, and others, as they were led-on by particular views and expectations, hasted away, at all times and hours, by sea and land into Scotland, to pay their adorations to the rising sun, the young king."—*Ibid.*

[3] "Or that she had heard some rumours, or received some intelligence from the French King, that many of the nobility did, by private letters, court and caress the K. of Scots, who was adored by them, as the rising sun."—*Ibid.* 652.

---

[1] "The oppressions which people underwent from the bottomless deep of the canon law, put them upon removing their causes into Westminster Hall, by getting *prohibitions* to stay proceedings in the bishops' courts, or in the High Commission." (Neal. i. 506.) "These *prohibitions* protected the Puritans, in some measure, from the power of their enemies, whose fears were aroused by the advanced age of the queen, and the prospect of a Presbyterian successor." (Price. i. 440.) The common lawyers "had always manifested a great jealousy of the spiritual jurisdiction, and had early learned to restrain its exorbitances by *writs of prohibition* from the temporal courts. Whitgift, as tenacious of power as the most ambitious of his predecessors, murmured, like them, at this subordination, for such it evidently was, to a lay tribunal. But the judges, who found as much gratification in exerting their power as the bishops, paid little regard to the remonstrances of the latter. We find the reports of this and the succeeding reign full of cases of prohibitions." — Hallam. *Const. Hist.* i. 288.

[2] "About these times (1598), a way began to be practised, by *prohibitions*, to stop proceedings, not only in the bishops' ordinary courts, and in the civil courts of justice, but in this high commission ecclesiastical, however ratified and established by statute. And a censure ready to be inflicted in this court upon a delinquent, was suddenly stopped, without any conference with the commissioners." (Strype. *Whitgift.* ii. 397.) In 1598, accordingly, a series of enquiries was drawn up by members of the High Commission Court, as to the legality and expediency of these hinderances to its proceedings. A similar series was prepared about 1600. Both may be seen in Strype. (397. 439.) Irritated by such hinderances, Whitgift occasionally spoke contemptuously of the legal profession. "The temporal lawyer," he wrote to Cecil, "whose learning is no learning any where, but here at home, being born to nothing, doth by his labour and travel in that barbarous knowledge, purchase to himself and his heirs for ever a thousand pounds *per annum*, and oftentimes much more, whereof there are at this day many examples."

Perhaps the civilians might have rather encroached upon the ordinary tribunals. At all events, these latter were sufficiently forward in resistance, and Puritanism eagerly sought gratification and protection, from setting Westminster Hall against Doctors' Commons. When a sovereign, strictly educated in Presbyterianism, came to the throne, puritanical opposition naturally assumed a wider range, and a bolder tone. James, too, was known to have spoken contumeliously of the English Church. Some years ago, besides venting publicly senseless, vulgar cavils, against Easter and Christmas, as festivals unwarranted by Scripture, he had stigmatised the Liturgy, as an *evil-said mass*[1]. Whitgift, and other admirers of established principles, naturally looked forward with uneasiness to such an occupancy of the throne. They talked of it familiarly as a *Scottish mist*[2]. The archbishop, however, was careful to keep his apprehensions under control of prudence and duty. When the queen expired, he despatched immediately Dr. Thomas Neville, dean of Canterbury, into Scotland, to compliment the new sovereign, and bespeak his favour for the Church. James was now older, and far more independent than when he echoed Presbyterian prejudice. He had been, besides, intolerably galled by the liberties of rude, fanatical ministers, who made conscience a plea for indulging their own insolence and ill-humour[1]. Nor was he likely to want that regard for the decent splendour of religion, and the refinement of its ministers, which is common to such as have access to the higher gratifications of society. He gave, accordingly, to Neville a very satisfactory reception, assuring him of a determination to continue the Church, as his illustrious predecessor had left it[2].

---

[1] "In the general assembly at Edinburgh, 1590, when standing with his bonnet off, and his hands lifted up to heaven, he praised God that he *was born in the time of the light of the Gospel, and in such a place, as to be king of such a Church, the sincerest* (purest) *kirk in the world. The Church of Geneva keep Pasche and Yule: what have they for them? They have no institution. As for our neighbour kirk of England, their service is an evil-said mass in English; they want nothing of the mass but the liftings.*"—CALDERWOOD. *apud* NEAL. ii. 2.

[2] The archbishop, "and some of the bishops, particularly the bishop of London" (Bancroft), "feared much that when this king came to reign in this realm, he would favour the *new discipline*, and make alterations in the ecclesiastical government and liturgy, and this had made them sometimes speak uneasily of the *Scotch mist*, which Hugh Broughton would now and then throw in the archbishop's teeth, when he was displeased with him."—STRYPE. *Whitgift*. ii. 469.

To shake this resolution, great exertions were made by the Puritans. They did not mean him to reach his new capital, until he received a petition, in favour of their views, from a thousand discontented clergyman. The number of names really subscribed was considerably under eight hundred, but only twenty-five counties furnished them[3]. It was not unreasonable, therefore, to assume, that all England would have supplied a full thousand, hence the memorial was entitled the *Millenary Petition*. It was regularly presented, while James was on the road. After deprecating any imputation of schism, or faction, it complains of the following four leading particulars,—the Liturgy, Ministry, Endowments, and Discipline. There was no mention made either of prescribed prayers, or of episcopal government[1].

---

[1] James himself said of the Scottish preachers, "that they used commonly to tell the people in their sermons, *that all kings are naturally enemies to the liberty of the Church, and could never patiently bear the yoke of Christ.* In Scotland, he said, his royalty was *without state, without honour, without order. Beardless boys braved him, every day, to his face. Jack, Tom, and Will, censured at their pleasure, both him and his council. Will stood up and said, I will have it thus: Dick replied, Nay, marry; but it shall be so.*" — HEYLIN. *Hist. Presb.* 367. BARLOW'S *Summe and Substance of the Conference at Hampton Court.* Lond. 1604. pp. 4. 79.

[2] PAULE'S *Whitgift.* 115.

[3] "Clarke states them at above seven hundred and fifty, from twenty-five counties only." (PRICE. i. 452. note.) From a Puritan publication of 1605, it appears that Suffolk supplied the greatest number of signatures (seventy-one), and Oxfordshire the smallest (nine). Leicestershire, Essex, and Northamptonshire, supplied fifty-seven each; London only thirty. (*Ibid.*) If the petitioners had not been hurried by anxiety to address the king before his arrival in London, it is likely that many more would have subscribed. Such was clearly the intention, for they talk of themselves as "more than a thousand," and

---

ridiculously add, that they were "all groaning as under a common burden of human rites and ceremonies." They account for the awkward fact of their actual conformity thus:—"Divers of us that sue for reformation, have formerly, in respect of the times, subscribed to the Book, some upon Protestation, some upon Exposition given them, some with Condition, rather than the Church should have been deprived of their labour and ministry." None, therefore, seemingly, thought any thing so bad as to interfere with the gaining, or the keeping of a benefice. It is no wonder that such petitioners should have been eager to take advantage of the king's presumed Presbyterian prejudices, before his full access to full information in London.

[1] "Although divers of us that sue for reformation, have formerly, in respect of the times, subscribed to the Book, some upon protestation, some upon exposition given them, some with condition, rather than the Church should have been deprived of their labour and ministerie: Yet now we, to the number of moe than a thousand of your Majesties subjects and ministers, all groaning, as under a common burden of human rites and ceremonies, doe, with one joynt consent, humble ourselves at your Majesties feet, to be eased and relieved in this behalf. Our humble suit then unto your Majesty is, that these offences following, some may be removed, some amended, some qualified.

"I. *In the Church-Service.* That the cross in baptism, interrogatories ministered to infants, confirmation, as superfluous, may be taken away. Baptism not to be ministered by women, and so explained. The cap and surplice not urged. That examination may go before the communion: that it be ministered with a sermon. That divers terms of *Priests* and *Absolution*, and some other used, with the ring in marriage, and other such like in the book, may be corrected. The longsomeness of Service abridged. Church-songs and music moderated to better edification. That the Lord's day be not profaned. The rest upon holidays not so strictly urged. That there may be an uniformity of doctrine prescribed. No Popish opinion to be any more taught, or defended. No ministers charged to teach the people to bow at the name of Jesus. That the canonical Scriptures only be read in the church.

This petition was extensively circulated, and while the king's opinion remained unknown, it was commonly represented as highly favourable[1]. To keep it so, many similar petitions, but not exclusively from clergymen, were set on foot. Some of them, however, expressed an

---

"II. *Concerning Church-Ministers.* That none hereafter be admitted into the ministerie, but able and sufficient men, and those to preach diligently, especially upon the Lord's day. That such as be already entered, and cannot preach, may either be removed, and some charitable course taken with them, or else be forced, according to the value of their livings, to maintain preachers. That non-residency be not permitted. That King Edward's statute, for the lawfulness of ministers' marriage, be revived. That ministers be not urged to subscribe, but according to the law, to the Articles of Religion, and the king's supremacie only.

"III. *For Church-Livings and Maintenance.* That bishops leave their *commendams;* some holding prebends, some parsonages, some vicarages, with their bishoprics. That double-beneficed men be not suffered to hold, some two, some three benefices with cure; and some two, three, or four dignities besides. That impropriations, annexed to bishoprics and colleges, be demised only to the preachers incumbents, for the old rent. That the impropriations of laymen's fees may be charged with a sixth or a seventh part of the worth, to the maintenance of the preaching minister.

"IV. *For Church-Discipline.* That the discipline and excommunication may be administered, according to Christ's own institution: or at the least, that enormities may be redressed. As namely, that excommunication come not forth under the name of any lay person, chancellor, official, &c. That men be not excommunicated for trifles, and twelve-penny matters, that none be excommunicated without consent of his pastor, that the officers be not suffered to extort unreasonable fees. That none, having jurisdiction, or registrar's places, put out the same to farm. That divers Popish canons (as for restraint of marriage at certain times) be reversed. That the longsomeness of suits in ecclesiastical courts (which hang sometimes two, three, four, five, six, or seven years,) may be restrained. That the oath *ex officio*, whereby men are forced to accuse themselves, be more sparingly used. That licenses for marriage, without banns asked, be more cautiously granted.

"These, with other abuses, yet remaining and practised in the Church of England, we are able to show not to be agreeable to the Scriptures, if it shall please your Highness farther to hear us, or more at large by writing to be informed, or by conference among the learned to be resolved."—Fuller. B. x. p. 23.

[1] Strype. *Whitgift.* ii. 481.

indefinite latitude of expectation, which was grossly injudicious[1]. They rendered it perfectly plain, that an active party was bent upon subversion, not satisfaction in some few particulars. Moderate Puritans might have rested contentedly under the abolition of certain ceremonies, a wider measure of ministerial discretion, and a more equal distribution of preferment. Many of their friends would clearly stop at nothing short of a complete Presbyterian revolution. Archbishop Whitgift watched such movements with deep uneasiness. He could not help fearing a new sovereign, educated in Presbyterianism, and surrounded by courtiers eager to make a prey of defenceless Churchmen. Hence the last summer of his useful life passed heavily away amidst gloomy forebodings[2]. He did not, however, abate any thing of his habitual vigilance. Perfectly aware that all interested parties, and many careless thinkers besides, make no distinction between unanswered and unanswerable, he suffered no petition or pamphlet, of any signification, to circulate long without a reply[3]. Thus, while the Puritans reckoned upon speedy victory, their opponents were daily making effective preparations to mortify them by a new defeat.

The two universities were early in the field[4]. Cambridge took the lead. A grace was passed there[5], to deny a degree, and suspend from one already taken.

---

[1] Fuller. B. x. p. 24.

[2] Strype. *Whitgift.* ii. 481.

[3] *Ibid.* 482.

[4] "The universities (and justly) found themselves much aggrieved" (by the *Millenary Petition*), "that the petitioners should apportion a seventh part only out of an impropriation in a layman's fee; whilst those belonging to colleges and cathedrals should be demised to the vicars at the *old rent*, without fine, without improvement."—Fuller. B. x. p. 23.

[5] June 9.—Strype. *Whitgift* ii. 483.

every person who should impugn openly, either by word or writing, or any other way, the doctrine or discipline of the Church of England, whether wholly or partially. Adverting to this grace as a commendable example, Oxford published a formal answer to the *Millenary Petition*, dedicated to the archbishop, and others of the privy council[1]. This reduced alleged grievances to the two heads of ceremonies and abuses: the former, undoubtedly, form no very satisfactory ground for provoking a national ferment; nor were specified instances of the latter such as to render the experiment advisable. With interest and passion, indeed, every thing in the way, or disrelished, or misunderstood, is an abuse. The university, however, did not admit any overwhelming adoption of such representations. It spoke of the objectors as few, and fairly pleaded the indiscretion of disturbing established arrangements for the sake of such a minority. The times would not allow men to stop at a position so reasonable. The memorial denounced it as "insufferable" to let institutions, "long and well settled, to be so much as questioned." Every objection was then particularly examined[2].

Public attention was at first but imperfectly at liberty for these questions, from the discovery of a conspiracy with Romish aims. Whatever grounds sanguine speculators might have assumed for imputing a Presbyterian bias to James, he suffered none to suppose him popishly inclined. Stopping at Newcastle, in his way upwards, he gladdened most of the miserable inmates in the gaol by a free pardon: but prisoners for papistry were excepted[1]. Romanists were thus warned, with mortifying plainness, against expectations of favour from the son of her whom they represented as a martyr in their cause. They must have been galled by such a disappointment. The first explosion of their soreness came from a quarter in which it seemed least likely to be expected. William Watson and William Clarke, two Romish priests, were detected in some treasonable practices. Both had written against the Jesuits. The former, indeed, by his *Important Considerations* and *Quodlibets*, has vitally damaged English Romanism. Its opponents have to thank him for confirming many of their most important views and statements. However honest may be such a witness, nothing but abandonment of his former principles will allow him much credit for worldly wisdom. Neither Watson, however, nor his unhappy friend, appears to have imbibed a Protestant bias. They were, seemingly, sincere Romanists, goaded into violence by Jesuitic assumption, and persuaded in happier times, that religion is endangered, rather than served, by political agitation. Men so behind in discerning the real necessities of their sect, were very likely to harbour absurd speculations, and few wear a less feasible air than those by which they threw their lives away. It is, indeed, some sort of extenuation of their folly, that Sir Walter Raleigh was one of their accomplices. Even he, however, with all his great abilities, and other valuable qualities, had never been prudent. He had not, indeed, sufficient principle. He was now writhing under all the bitterness of disappointment. His rival, Robert Cecil, had, like himself, been obnoxious to

---

[1] "Entitled, *An Answer of the Vice-Chancellor, Doctors, Proctors, and other the Heads of Houses in the University of Oxford.* Printed there."—STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 483.

[2] *Ibid.* 484.

---

[1] April 11. "Hee released all prysoners, except for treason, murther, and papistrie, giving summes of money for the release of many that lay for debt."—STOWE. 819.

James, but Elizabeth's reign was then likely to continue. Its speedy termination no sooner became clearly discernible, than Cecil opened a secret but zealous communication with Scotland, and he now basked under the meridian of royal favour. Raleigh had shewn no such tact, and felt his prospects blighted. He was thus easily led blindfold by rage, envy, and cupidity, into senseless projects which an intellect like his would ordinarily have scouted[1]. He, the two priests, and some other desperate men, embarked in a guilty scheme to place Lady Arabella Stuart upon the throne. She was equally near to Henry VII. with James himself, and lawyers had sufficient ground for pleading the superiority of her title[2]. Upon the use to be made of her, except as a tool for their own personal aggrandisement[3], the conspirators, probably, thought loosely and differently: a more motley group having rarely joined in such an enterprise[4]. The two priests, however, were to secure at least a toleration for their religion. But how the scheme generally was to be realised, or what was its precise nature, is very little known. There is, in fact, hardly any considerable political movement, so recent, and connected with such a name as Raleigh's, that is altogether more obscure[1].

---

[1] "If Raleigh had ever shewn a discretion bearing the least proportion to his genius, we might reject the whole story as improbable. But it is to be remembered that there had long been a Catholic faction, who fixed their hopes on Arabella; so that the conspiracy, though extremely injudicious, was not so perfectly unintelligible as it appears to a reader of Hume, who has overlooked the previous circumstances."—HALLAM. *Const. Hist.* i. 483.

[2] "Margaret," (daughter of Henry VII.,) "as we have seen, was married, first to James IV. of Scotland, and after his decease, to Archibald, earl of Angus. James, the English king, was great-grandson and heir of the first marriage, Lady Arabella Stuart was the great-granddaughter and heiress of the second. By the act of the twenty-seventh of Queen Elizabeth, a person found guilty of pretending to the crown, or attempting any invasion, insurrection, or assassination against Queen Elizabeth, was excluded from all claim to the succession. The Queen of Scots was evidently within the provisions of this act, and supposing it to extend to James, the Lady Arabella was legal heir to the crown."—BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* iii. 274.

[3] "It was agreed at Westminster, that Watson should be L. Chancellor, Brooke, L. Treasurer, and Sir Grif. Markham, Secretary."—STOWE. 830.

[4] "Raleigh was generally thought to be a deist, Lord Grey

After discovery, the parties implicated were long detained without trial[2]: which looks like a deficiency of evidence. They were conveyed, at length, from London to Winchester, and there convicted of high treason[3]. Within a fortnight, the two priests were executed in the same city; and being cut down, while perfectly alive, the brutal humours of spectators were sated to repletion[4].

---

was a puritan, Lord Cobham a professed debauchee; they were joined by half-a-dozen other gentlemen, and by Watson and Clarke, two Roman-Catholic priests."—BUTLER. iii. 275.

[1] "The whole of this transaction is yet a mystery. Sir John Hawles, solicitor-general in the reign of William III., remarks, that *what was proved against the Lords Cobham and Grey, Watson and Clarke, does not appear, or how their trials were managed.*"—*Ibid.* 276.

[2] They were arrested early in July.—STOWE. 826.

[3] Nov. 15. They were indicted for conspiring "to kill the king, to raise rebellion, to alter religion, to subvert the estate, to procure invasion by straungers. To effect these treasons, on the fourteenth of June, 1603, the 1. yeere of K. James the first, they intended their act against the king and his sonne, and to carry them to the Tower, and there to enter, and with the king's treasure in the Tower, to maintayne their intent. But if the Tower could not be taken, then to take the castle of Dover, and to carry the king thither, and then and there to obtayne of the king three things: *viz.* 1. Pardon for their own presumption. 2. Tolleration of religion. 3. To remove some from the counsell. Watson, the priest, devised oathes in writing, by which the parties were bound to conceale their treasons. Clarke and Watson, priests, did say, the fourteenth of June, the king was no king untill after his coronation."—*Ibid.* 829.

[4] Nov. 29. (STOWE. 831.) Mr. Butler has reprinted from the *Hardwicke Papers*, the following account by an eye-witness, of this horrible execution. "The two priests were both very bloodily handled; for they were both cut-down alive, and Clarke, to whom favour was intended, had the worse luck, for he both strove to help himself, and spoke after he

Guilt was admitted by both, and considerable penitence exhibited: by Clarke especially. Watson insinuated that his fate was owing to Jesuitic craft[1]. He might have

---

was cut-down. They died boldly both; Watson, as he would have it seem, willing; wishing he had more lives to spend, and one to lose for every one he had by his treachery drawn into this treason. Clarke stood somewhat upon his justification, and thought he had hard measure; but imputed it to his function, and therefore thought his death meritorious, a kind of martyrdom."—*Hist. Mem.* iii. 276.

[1] "Watson first acknowledged his offence, secondly asked mercy of the king and state, desiring God to prosper both in peace and amitie. Thirdly hee was sorry hee had drawne so many into that action, wishing he had so many bodies as might satisfy the king's majesty for all that had conspired, and were in durance, and like to suffer for that action. Fourthly, he forgave, and desired to bee forgiven of all, namely, that the Jesuits would forgive him, if he had written over eagerly against them, saying also that it was occasioned by them, whom hee forgave, if they had coningly and covertly drawn him into the action for which hee suffered. Hee desired al to witnesse that hee died a true catholike, and al true Romish catholikes to pray for him. Clarke in little differed from Watson, only hee seemed not engaged in the action so much, hee was drawne-in by Watson. Hee said hee hadde written a dialogue betweene a gentleman and a scholler, concerning *The obedience and loyalty of subiects towardes their king.* And did therefore mention the booke, least happely if it were after printed, it might not bee thought to have bin written by him. His death was with more penitency than Watson's was: hee confessed hee relied only on the mercies of God, not his owne merites; desiring all Christian catholikes, and all which were in the unitie of the Church, to pray for him. Then both acknowledged that they suffered the judgement of death, not for their religion, or their function of priesthood, but for that their treasonable act, which the judges, by the lawes, whose wisedomes they rather commended than would blame, hadde censured for treason, though their intents and harts to God were cleare in that point; onely Clarke said, hee knew not the certaintie, yet hee thought his priesthood, at least by accidence, hadde hastened his execution." (Stowe. 831.)

"Hor per venire subito a capo, l' Watsono compiè l' opere sue col tramar la morte a Jacopo lo Scozese, pochi mesi appresso all' esser unto e coronato re d' Inghilterra: e complice, e conguirato seco un certo Clark, stato un de' celebri seditiosi del seminario di Roma. Presi, confessi, strascinati al sopplicio de' traditori nella piazza d' Wincester, l' Watson d' in su la forca, e col capestro alla gola, confessò in alta voce, primeramente, d' haver machinato contro alla vita del re, e alla pace del regno; poi *contro a' padri della compagnia di Giesù scritti e stampati varij*

honestly believed so, even without sufficient evidence, and we have no trace of such. But although a Protestant partisan may be glad of the insinuation, a serious Christian must regret it. He did not, however, die without acknowledging himself an offender against the Jesuits, and intreating their pardon. On their part, a display was made of forgiveness, by the celebration of masses for the repose of his soul. But he had sinned past all real forgiveness. He had been a servitor in the seminary at Rheims, and is charged with occasional conformity to Protestantism, and espionage on the Romanists, after his return to England. In the latter charge, there must have been something of truth, appeals being made to extant letters of his own, in support of it[1]. Watson, however, might have rendered some such services to the government without any compromise of integrity. The main

---

libri falsi e scandalosi, e lor chiederne perdonanza: il che detto, e accommandato in affetti, e parole di salutevole pentimento, il suo spirito a Dio, compiè a doveri della giustitia, impeso, e sviscerato mentre pur ancor era vivo: e similmente il Clark, I padri, come richiede il debito della carità Christiana, ne accompagnarono l' anime col suffragio di parecchi messe: singolarmente il Personio, ch' era un de' piu mortalmente feriti dalle lor penne." (BARTOLI. 439.) Upon this account, it is needful to remark that Watson does not seem to have admitted any substantial falsehood in his attacks upon the Jesuits, only intemperance. Bartoli, writing sixty years after the event, was very likely to overlook this.

[1] "Guglielmo Watson, stato gia servidore nel seminario di Rems, poi a mani e a piedi salito a saper tanto che potè venir di Francia a fruttificare nell Inghilterra. Quindi scoperto e preso, si rendè al volere de' ministri, e de' consiglieri della Reina: andò alle chiese di quegli, e a questi manifestò i Cattolici che gli havean dato albergo: e ve ne son lettere, nelle quali lor dimanda perdono. Indi fattosi come capo di parte, si diè a scrivere tanto piu arditamente, quanto a calunniare, e mentire, non gli era necessario di saper molto; e stampò orribilissimi libri, e quello infra gli altri che intitolò *Quodlibetici:* de' quali, a dire il tutto in poco, un istorico Calvinista (R. Johnston) detto il peggio che gli venne alla penne, e di noi, e de' sacerdoti tenenti col Arciprete, soggiugne, *Si quis plura videre velit, Quodlibetica Watsoni consulat. Nihil ibi sceleris, nihil flagitii prætermittitur.*"—BARTOLI. 438.

principle running through his writings, is a feeling of disgrace and injury brought upon Romanism, by a secular, unpatriotic, pernicious alliance with foreign politics. That he felt soundly here, none will question, whatever may be thought of his discretion and shrewdness. A man so impressed, might give some degree of information with a view to lighten an undeniable evil, and still deserve respect for all the more substantial excellences of character. He might consider some sacrifice of confidence excusable, and even desirable, to wean a society which he regarded only in a spiritual point of view, from a hateful taint of worldliness in its most objectionable form. But, whatever may have been the rate of Watson's more sterling qualities, they really affect his testimony very slightly. A few circumstances are preserved by him, which have no great bearing upon controversy, and which, therefore, all parties receive contentedly at his hands. The bulk of those appeals to him which gratify Protestants, and offend Romanists, turn upon facts, proved abundantly elsewhere, and upon opinions, which no one ventures openly to controvert. This authority is really valuable, as evidence that confirmation for Protestant history may be successfully sought even from Romish prejudice, under the process of calm conviction, or upon the rack of resentment. Such testimony is of considerable advantage in controversy, and Watson's church has ever smarted under the indiscretion that gave it over to the opposite side. Hence lives rashly jeoparded to purchase toleration for Romanism, have earned for the unfortunate victims no reputation of martyrdom. Both Watson and Clarke, excite contempt, or aversion, in all who cherish their opinions[1].

[1] "Whatever may have been the part of Watson or Clarke in

A conference having been requested by the millenary petitioners, it was determined early to give them this gratification. It seems, however, to have been very far from the king's intention, that Presbytery should prevail over the Established Church. He had, indeed, been so vexatiously thwarted, and grossly insulted by his native kirk, that he was little likely to relish any farther contact with such a system. He published, accordingly, a proclamation[1], denouncing the exertions for getting-up petitions, as

---

this transaction, the Catholics have never placed them among the sufferers on account of religion, or thought them entitled to particular commiseration. It is observable that both Watson and Clarke were strenuously opposed to the Spanish party, and that each had written with great vehemence against the Jesuits, as its active partisans. Both, on the scaffold, acknowledged, and asked pardon of the society for the intemperance of their writings. *It was very fit*, says Dodd, in his account of Watson, that *he should make a disclaim of his passion, and several groundless aspersions which he had uttered.*" (BUTLER. iii. 277.) Milner says that James, before his accession to the English throne, had corresponded with Watson, "who was a warm partisan of his interest against that of Spain, and to whom, amongst others, he made strong promises of shewing indulgence towards the Catholics of England, whenever he should mount the throne of this country." (*Letters to a Prebendary*. 194.) "Cecil began his ministry, under the present reign, by playing off that most absurd and incoherent farce, called Sir Walter Raleigh's plot, by means of which he put out of the way one man, who was peculiarly obnoxious to him, on account of his being privy to the king's promises in favour of Catholics. This was the priest, Watson, mentioned above." (*Ibid.* 195.) If such be the truth, Watson has a fair claim to take station among the Romish martyrs of these times, in spite of the indiscreet admissions wrung from him by antipathy to the Jesuits. He was, in fact, a conspirator for the very cause in favour at Rome. "Clement VIII., who had no other view than to secure the re-establishment of the Catholic faith in England, and had the judgement to perceive that the ascendancy of Spain would neither be endured by the nation, nor permitted by the French king, favoured the claim of Arabella, who, though apparently of the reformed religion, was rather suspected at home of wavering in her faith; and entertained a hope of marrying her to the Cardinal Farnese, brother to the Duke of Parma."—HALLAM. i. 391.

[1] At Wilton. Oct. 24.—STRYPE. *Whitgift*. ii. 489.

"unlawful, savouring of tumult, sedition, and violence[1]." In religious polity, he professed himself justified in thinking his new kingdom conformable both to Scripture and the Primitive Church. Thus he stood committed pretty thoroughly to the maintenance of existing institutions. At the same time, he professed himself "not ignorant that time might have brought in some corruptions which might deserve a review and amendment[2]." The Church party, therefore, was not freed from uneasiness, nor were the Puritans left without encouragement. The latter might reasonably reckon, if only moderate in present demands, upon some concessions, useful hereafter as points of a wedge[3]. Impatience for this advantage was bridled by a contagious malady that raged in London. The desired conference was originally fixed for the 1st of November, but fear of infection rendered men shy of any considerable assemblage, and it was deferred until the beginning of another year.

It met at Hampton Court, in January; Thursday, the

---

[1] This language was confirmed by legal authorities. "But the most enormous outrage on the civil rights of these men was the commitment to prison of ten among those who had presented the Millenary Petition; the judges having declared in the star-chamber, that it was an offence finable at discretion, and very near to treason and felony, as it tended to sedition and rebellion."—HALLAM. i. 406.

[2] STRYPE. *ut supra.*

[3] "We find that some of the rigid Nonconformists did confess in a pamphlet, *The Christian's modest offer of the silenced Ministers*, 1606, that those who were appointed to speak for them at Hampton Court, were *not of their nomination or judgement;* they insisted that these delegates should declare at once against the whole church establishment, *&c.*, and model the government to each particular man's notions! But these delegates prudently refused to acquaint the king with the secret opinions of their mad constituents. (*Lansdowne MSS.* 1056. 51.) This confession of the Nonconformists is also acknowledged by their historian, Neal."—D'ISRAELI. *Inquiry into the Literary and Political Character of James I.* Lond. 1816. p. 29. note.

12th, being the day originally appointed, when the parties summoned, were in attendance, at nine in the morning, although prepared for procrastination by a rumour of the preceding night. James then informed the bishops of his inability to preside on that day, and desired them, with the other parties, to come again on the following Saturday, the 14th. Then mustered in an outer apartment, Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury, the bishops, Bancroft, of London, Matthew, of Durham, Bilson, of Winchester, Babington, of Worcester, Rudd, of St. David's, Watson, of Chichester, Robinson, of Carlisle, and Dove, of Peterborough; the deans, Montague, of the chapel, Andrewes, of Westminster, Overall, of St. Paul's, Barlow[1], of Chester, and Bridges, of Salisbury; with the doctors, King, archdeacon of Nottingham, and Field, subsequently, dean of Gloucester[2]. They were all canonically habited, and proceeded into the presence-chamber. There they found sitting on a form, habited in Turkey gowns[3], the doctors, John Reynolds, and Thomas Sparke, from Oxford, with Mr. Chadderton, and Mr. Knewstubbs, from Cambridge. The bishops were admitted into an inner room[4], and an order soon came forth for the five deans to come in likewise, with any members of the privy council, but all others were to be excluded. Exception has been taken to this, but really with very little reason; the object being to consider whether any concessions might not be offered, without previous debate with objecting parties. Obviously thus time might be spared, and irritation avoided. Complaints have also been made of the authority which brought the four puritanical divines to Hampton. They were not elected at any meeting of their friends, or party, but summoned by royal mandate[1]. It was, however, the same with their opponents, and a more eligible selection could not be made in either case. Reynolds was among the most learned of his party, and, indeed, of his age[2]; nor were his three coadjutors unworthy of acting with such a man. That all were less violent than many who agreed with them, will generally be thought equally an honour to themselves, and a reason why they should have been chosen to speak for their body.

---

[1] BARLOW. *The Summe and Substance of the Conference, which it pleased his excellent Majestie to have with the Lords, Bishops, and other of his Clergie (at which the most of the Lordes of the Councell were present) in his Majesties Privy-Chamber, at Hampton Court. January* 14, 1603. Lond. 1604. The author, then dean of Chester, was one of the parties.

[2] COLLIER. ii. 673.

[3] "These delegates had nothing of the canonical habit, but appeared in gowns of the shape of those then commonly worn by Turkey merchants." (*Ibid.*) Yet Reynolds was then president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and had been dean of Lincoln.

[4] "A withdrawing-room within the Privy Chamber."—*Semper Eadem: or a Reference of the Debate at the Savoy*, 1661, *to the Conference at Hampton Court*, 1603-4. Lond. 1662.

James lost no time in removing completely all those apprehensions which his education and habits naturally engendered. With much kindness of manner, he professed himself happier than any one of his four immediate predecessors, in being driven to religious innovation neither by necessity, nor inclination. Puritanism he had disliked ever since ten years old, and although living among those who professed it, he *was not of them*[3]. It was, indeed, reasonable to believe, that nothing short of compulsion could have kept him under a system, which ostentatiously trampled his pride under foot, and was far from nice even as to his just expectations. Thus none could be surprised, at his pleasure in contrasting the coarse intemperance of his country's divines, with manners, degenerating, undoubtedly, into the other extreme, which he had found among the scholarly, well-bred churchmen of England. Still, it was impossible to calculate beforehand exactly upon the force of early prepossessions, especially as they might be made a convenient cloak for selfish designs upon an opulent hierarchy. But his homely candour now rendered it perfectly plain that James abhorred few things more than the preaching demagogues of Scotland, and was hence anxious to bid their system a final farewell. There were, however, a few points in the English Church, upon which he desired fuller satisfaction. Confirmation seemed as if baptism were blasphemously thought incomplete; absolution had been pronounced akin to the pardons of Popery; private baptism by females and laymen, he utterly disliked; excommunication for light causes, appeared improper, and requiring in every case, the bishop personally to pronounce it, assisted by his dean and chapter. The king also expressed himself desirous of consulting about fit and able ministers for Ireland[1].

---

[1] "Their ministers had been invited by the king, instead of being nominated by themselves, and had argued for the indifference, rather than the sinfulness of the ceremonies."—Price. i. 469.

[2] "Reynolds, the principal disputant on the Puritan side, was nearly, if not altogether, the most learned man in England. He was censured by his faction for making a weak defence; but the king's partiality and intemperance plead his apology. He is said to have complained of unfair representation in Barlow's account."—Hallam. i. 404.

[3] Barlow. 20.

Confirmation, he was told in reply, had all antiquity to support it, having been omitted nowhere until lately by the unadvised innovation of certain particular churches. Even Calvin, however, conceded authority for it in the Epistle to the Hebrews[2], and expressed a wish for its restitution in churches that had discontinued it. In supposing the Church of England to cast any doubt upon the completeness of baptism, it was shewn him, that he had been misled. To render any such error impossible for the future, it was proposed to introduce the Confirmation service by an explanatory title, making the rite a seal to ascertained religious proficiency. To all substantial alteration, the king declared himself opposed[1].

---

[1] Barlow. 7.

[2] Heb. vi. 2.

Upon the Absolution, in the ordinary service, he was easily satisfied. Nor did he find any fault, upon examination, with that in the office for visiting the sick. It was conformable, he was told, with the Augsburg, Bohemian, and Saxon Confessions, and even with an expressed opinion of Calvin's. In conclusion, it was deemed advisable to insert the words, *or remission of sins*, after the word *absolution* in the rubric, to the form in the daily service[2]. Thus, it was thought, all appearance of exceptionable adherence to Romish theology might be avoided.

Private baptism by females and laymen, the archbishop argued, was against the authority of the Church, and accordingly an irregularity into which inquiry was often made at episcopal visitations[3]. Bishop Babington, however, admitted that the king was right in considering such baptism compatible with the words of the rubric, and that the compilers of the Common Prayer meant them to convey this latitude. He thought, indeed, that they would have spoken to that point more plainly, had not they been afraid of parliamentary opposition[1]. Of their intention to authorize baptism by persons incapable of other ministerial functions, Bishop Bancroft added, evidence remained in some of their letters: from which he read extracts, and he maintained the consonance of such views with primitive antiquity. The last plea James considered inconclusive, as drawn from a time when Christianity was altogether under circumstances different from the present. He professed himself, however, a believer in baptismal regeneration, and in the necessity of that sacrament, where it is lawfully attainable, that is, from a regular minister[2]. Farther argument was found unavailing to move him from this position, and at last, it was determined to consult whether the words *curate, or lawful minister*, should not be introduced into the rubric for the office of Private Baptism[3].

---

[1] "The conclusion was, for the fuller explanation (that wee make it not a Sacrament, or a corroboration to a former Sacrament) that it should be considered by their Lordships, whether it might not without alteration (whereof his Majestie was still very wary) bee intituled an *Examination* with a *Confirmation*."—BARLOW. 12.

[2] *Ibid.* 13.

[3] "When some articles were passed by both houses of Convocation, in 1575, the Archbishop and bishops (who had power and authority in their several dioceses *to resolve all doubts concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute the things contained in the book of Common Prayer*,) unanimously resolved that even private baptism in case of necessity, was only to be administered by a lawful minister, or deacon." (WHEATLY. *Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer.* Oxf. 1819. p. 371.) This article was omitted in the printed copy, (one of those conciliatory liberties with authorized formularies for which Elizabeth's reign is so remarkable) but, probably, the bi-

---

shops insisted upon observance of it, and Whitgift, now aged and declining, might have forgotten the authority adverse to it.

[1] "And for this conjecture, as I remember, he cited the testimony of my Lord Archbishop of Yorke."—BARLOW. 15.

[2] "Hee also maintained the necessitie of Baptisme, and always that the place of St. John, *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua*, &c. (Joh. iii. 5) was meant of the sacrament of Baptisme."—*Ib.* 17.

[3] "When necessity requires that Baptism be privately administered. *The Minister of the Parish, or in his absence, some other lawful Minister, is to be procured.* This is an order which was not made till after the conference at Hampton-court, upon the accession of King James I. to the throne. In both Common Prayer books of King Edward, and in that of Queen Elizabeth, the rubric was only this: *First, let them that be present call upon God for his grace, and say the Lord's Prayer, if the time will suffer; and then one of them shall name the child, and dip him in the water,*

As to excommunication, James proposed, either that some new term should be found for an equivalent censure, in cases of inferior importance; or that such cases should be met hereafter by some coercive remedy entirely new. To this proposition no objection was made, popular clamour against indiscriminate excommunications in ecclesiastical courts, having been felt as not altogether unreasonable. But such were conformable to ancient usage, and had been sanctioned by the late queen, a sufficient reason for leaving them undisturbed during her reign. She had adopted *semper eadem* for her motto, and took such a pride in adhering to the principle, that all about her were very unwilling to talk of retractation[1].

Although the result of this day's conference was very far from unsatisfactory to the Church party, yet James had shewn himself resolved upon certain changes, and

---

or pour water upon him, saying these words, N. *I baptise thee, &c.* Now this, it is plain from the writings and letters of our first Reformers, was originally designed to commission lay persons to baptise in cases of necessity: being founded on an error which our Reformers had imbibed in the Romish Church, concerning the impossibility of salvation without the sacrament of Baptism: which therefore being in their opinion so absolutely necessary, they chose should be administered by anybody that was present, in cases of necessity, rather than that any should die without it. But afterwards, when they came to have clearer notions of the Sacraments, and perceived how absurd it was to confine the mercies of God to outward means; and especially to consider that the salvation of the child might be as safe in God's mercy, without any baptism, as with one performed by persons not duly commissioned to administer it: when the governors of our Church, I say, came to be convinced of this, they thought it proper to explain the rubric above mentioned, in such a manner as should exclude any private person from administering Baptism." (WHEATLY. 371.) "It had been customary in the Church of Rome, and the custom was not formally abolished, nor entirely discontinued, in England, after the Reformation, to license midwives for the performance of the sacrament, and the baptism, when performed, was to be certified to the curate of the parish."—CARWITHEN. *History of the Church of England.* Lond. 1829. ii. 195.

[1] BARLOW. 19.

his mode of proposing them seems to have awakened some misgivings in the prelates and deans present. Hence reports got abroad highly flattering to puritanical hopes[1]. These were effectually damped by the second meeting[2]. At this, the only bishops present were Bancroft, of London, and Bilson, of Winchester[3], who were assisted by the deans and doctors that attended on Saturday[4]. This diminution in the number of their opponents was probably meant as an assurance to the Puritan divines of equitable treatment. The four were now admitted into the Privy Chamber, with Patrick Galloway, formerly a minister at Perth. Reynolds, as became his learning and station, took the lead in explaining their views. All knelt, according to established usage in addressing the sovereign. He first objected to a clause in the Sixteenth Article, as insufficient, it so standing as to be available against the doctrine of *assurance.* Now, both he and his party had adopted all the soul-stirring flights of Calvinistic theology, and were, therefore, naturally impatient of such sentences in the national formularies, as might make our own Reformers appear of a different opinion. Their next desire, accordingly, was that the nine Lambeth Articles, which were complimented as *orthodoxal*, should be incorporated in the Thirty-nine. Reynolds then objected to the article which denies the liberty of preaching and administering the sacraments, *in the congregation*, without lawful calling. It seemed like an universal permission, tacitly given, to do these things *out of the congregation.* He now complained of inconsistency. Confirmation appeared in the Articles as "a corrupt following of the Apostles;" in the office itself, "the example of Apostles," was pleaded, and even expectations given, apparently, of the spiritual gifts conveyed by them. Such inconsistencies ought to be rectified, and the grounds of such expectations carefully examined. In another article, the papal authority was insufficiently disclaimed. It was not enough to say that *the bishop of Rome hath no authority in this land.* It ought to be added, *nor ought to have.* Again: the Articles were insufficient from the want of an express assertion that *the intention of the minister is not of the essence of the sacrament*,—a deficiency that suggested a second mention of *the nine orthodoxal assertions concluded at Lambeth.* The ordinary catechism also was too brief, and Nowel's ran into the other extreme. The Sabbath-day required new regulations for its better keeping. The existing vernacular versions of Scripture were all faulty. Sufficient restrictions were not imposed upon the press, and upon the importation of books; Romish pieces, especially, of objectionable tendency, being in pretty free circulation. A learned minister ought to be planted in every parish: which was rendered needlessly difficult by requiring subscription to the Book of Common-Prayer, and the reading of apocryphal lessons, containing manifest errors. Reynolds then found fault with interrogatories in baptism: against which Knewstubbs farther argued, and went from them to the cross in baptism, which, however, Reynolds admitted might be traced up to the apostolic age. Exception was then taken to the surplice, as a kind of garment worn by the priests of Isis; to the words in the matrimonial office, *With my body I thee worship*; to the *churching of women*; and to excommunication by lay chancellors. To the ring in marriage, and the square cap, no objection was made. The last point in the day's business was a restoration of the *prophesyings*. These were desired in every rural deanery, with liberty to refer questions found incapable of decision within its limits, first, to the archdeacon's visitation, then to an episcopal synod, in which the bishop, assisted by his presbyters, might give a final judgment.

---

[1] "The result of this day's debate was reported by a Presbyterian minister (Patrick Galloway) to the presbytery of Edinburgh, in a manner very unfavourable to the bishops. According to his statement, the King commanded them, as they would answer it to God, on their consciences, and to himself, on their allegiance, to advise among themselves concerning the corruptions of the Church. The bishops reported that all was well, and when the King, with great earnestness, adduced many defects and abuses, they prayed him on their knees, that no alterations might take place. It is not improbable that this Presbyterian minister might have exhibited the doubts and objections of the King in a different light from that which was intended by James himself. He might have placed the objections of the Puritans in the strongest point of view, and have clothed them in the most offensive garb, to see whether they could be answered. Andrewes, afterward bishop of Winchester, penetrated into the motive of James; for he said, that on the first day, the King *during five hours did wonderfully play the Puritan*."—CARWITHEN. ii. 196.

[2] Monday, January 16.

[3] The king "admitted only two bishops to be present, to be named by my lord's grace of Canterbury; who sent thither the bishops of London and Winchester, while we, the rest, were with him, setting down the form of the other points."—Toby Matthew, Bishop of Durham, to Matthew Hutton, Archbishop of York. Jan. 19, 1604. STRYPE. *Whitgift.* iii. 404.

[4] BARLOW. 21.

While Reynolds was talking of confirmation, Bancroft lost his temper. The reason of his heat is hardly apparent, but it seems from the sequel, to have arisen from a suspicion, that confirmation by presbyters would be the next concession demanded. He hoped that his majesty would remember the ancient canon, which denies a hearing to schismatics against their bishops[1]. To this the present parties were especially obnoxious, if they were among the millenary subscribers, men who had before subscribed to the Liturgy. It was intolerable that any should thus retract their own acts. The indulgence, however, which these parties had experienced, was a signal clemency. Their attacks upon the Liturgy, and established discipline, were clearly against the Statute of Uniformity. He would be glad to know where they meant to end. Mr. Cartwright had pronounced conformity with Turks, better than with Papists[1]. Perhaps, they were of that opinion, and came, accordingly, not habited like scholars from the University, but in Turkey gowns.

---

[1] "The Bishop of London, much moved to heare these men, who, some of them, the evening before, and the same morning, had made semblance of joyning with the bishops, and that they sought for

---

nothing but unity, now strike to overthrow (if they could) all at once, cut him" (Reynolds) "off, and kneeling downe, most humbly desired his Majestie first, that the ancient canon might be remembered, which saith that *Schismatici contra episcopos non sunt audiendi.*"—Barlow. 26.

[1] "Now I will adde this further, that when as the Lorde was carefull to sever them by ceremonies from other nations, yet was he not so carefull to sever them from any, as from the Egyptians amongst whome they lived, and from those nations which were next neighbours unto them, because from them was the greatest feare of infection. Therefore, by this constant and perpetuall wisedome which God useth to kepe his people from idolatrie, it followeth that the religion of God should not only in matter and substance, but also as farre as may be, in forme and fashion, differ from that of the idolaters, and especially the Papists, which are round about us and amongst us. For in deede it were more safe for us to conforme our indifferent ceremonies to the Turkes, which are farre off, than to the Papists which are so neare. T. C. page 102. sect. 4." Whitgift designates this, in the margin, "an unadvised assertion," as it really is, being obviously open to the exceptions by which it was very soon generally assailed. In remarking upon it, he shews its hollowness by the facts, that Egypt and Israel did not worship the same God at all, and that many ceremonies were prescribed by God to his own people, of the same captivating kind that were used by heathens, as it has been thought, largely for the purpose of weaning them from the love of gentile superstitions. (Whitgift. *Defense.* 475.) Upon the whole, however, Cartwright's reasoning, though not built upon premises strictly accurate, is not fairly liable to the severe treatment which it received.

The king now interposed, slightly rebuking Bancroft for his passion, but admitting that it was not unprovoked, the opposing parties having encouraged expectations which were now frustrated. The bishop then observed upon the doctrine of *assurance*. Men leant upon it as an excuse for palpable defects in practical holiness. They said, *If I shall be saved, I shall be saved.* They did not reason, *Obedience to God, and love of my neighbour, make me trust that I have been elected, and predestinated to salvation.* Their argument was, *God hath predestinated and chosen me to life. Let my sin be never so grievous, I am safe: whom He loveth, He loveth to the end.* The Church of England stood committed to no such doctrines. She had used a wise caution in treating of God's promises, refusing to give them any other construction than such as is warranted by the very letter of Scripture. As for the Article, taxed with deficiency, because it said nothing of ministering *out* of the congregation, any such addition to it was wholly superfluous, no ministration being permitted, without episcopal license. Private baptism would be soon placed under satisfactory regulations. The Article charged with opposition to the Liturgy, from speaking of Confirmation, as a *corrupt following of the Apostles*, really said no such thing: the corruption alleged being merely the Romish notion that makes Confirmation a sacrament[1]. Nor is there any pretence to confer extraordinary spiritual gifts, by the imposition of hands, only prayer that the parties may be strengthened and confirmed by the Holy Ghost. But in truth, objections to confirmation really turn upon its restriction to bishops. Let presbyters have it open to them, and it would soon be reckoned an apostolical institution. Dr. Reynolds was challenged for a denial of this view, but he evaded a direct answer[1], and the bishop went on to shew that confirmation had ever been confined to his own order. His other appearances in this day's proceedings, were to assert scriptural authority for episcopacy, to mention a foreigner's commendation upon the Church of England[2], to throw doubts upon the policy of re-translating Scripture[3], to clear himself from blame for the circulation of objectionable books[4], to deny the exclusive

---

[1] "Those five, commonly called sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and extreme Unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures." (Art. XXV.) "We make our humble supplications unto thee for these thy servants, upon whom (after the example of thy holy Apostles) we have now laid our hands." (Collect in the *Order of Confirmation.*) Probably, the particular *corruption* intended by the Article, is the Romish use

---

of chrism, in which is found the matter of a sacrament. It must be owned, that the puritanical objection, though captious, and substantially inaccurate, is not incapable of a plausible appearance.

[1] "This was it that vexed them, that they had not the use thereof in their own handes, every pastor in his parish to confirme, for then it would be accounted an apostolicall institution; and willed Dr. Reyn. to speak herein what he thought; who seemed to yield thereunto, replying that some dioceses of a bishop having therein 600 parish churches, (which number caused the Bishop of London to thinke himself personally touched, because in his diocese there are 609, or thereabouts) it was a thing very inconvenient to commit confirmation unto the bishop alone, supposing it impossible that he could take due examination of them al which came to be confirmed."—BARLOW. 33.

[2] "My Lord of London there seriously put his Majesty in mind of the speeches which the French embassador, Mosr Rogne gave out concerning our Church of England, both at Canterbury, after his arrivall, and after, at the Court, upon the view of our solemne service, and ceremonies, namely, *that if the reformed churches in Fraunce had kept the same orders among them which we have, he was assured that there would have bene many thousands of Protestants more there than now there are.*"—*Ib.* 38.

[3] "My Lord of London wel added, that if every man's humour should be followed, there would be no ende of translating."—*Ib.* 46.

[4] "The Bishop of London supposing, as it seemed, himselfe to

claims of preaching upon clerical attention, to apologise for pluralities[1], to deprecate pulpit personalities, and to defend lessons from the Apocrypha.

Bishop Bilson called upon Dr. Reynolds, as a scholar, to produce ancient authorities for confirmation by any other than bishops. Clerical insufficiency, he attributed

---

be principally aimed at, aunswered first, to the generall, that there was no such licentious divulging of these books, as he imagined or complained of: and that none, except it were such as D. Reyn. who were supposed, wold confute them, had liberty, by authority to buye them: again; such books came into the realme by many secret conveyances, so that there could not bee a perfect notice had of their importation." (BARLOW. 49.) "At length it pleased his excellent Majestie to tell D. Reyn. that he was a better colledge man than a statesman; for if his meaning were to taxe the Bishop of London for suffering those books, betwixt the Secular Priestes, and Jesuites, lately published, so freely to passe abroad; his Majestie would have him and his associates to know, and willed them also to acquaint their adherents and friends abroad therewith, that the saide Bishop was much injured and slandered in that behalfe, who did nothing therein, but by warrant from the Lordes of the Councell, whereby, both a schisme betwixt them was nourished, and also his Majesties own cause and title handled: the Lord Cecill affirming thereunto, that therefore they were tollerated, because in them was the title of Spaine confuted. The L. Treasurer added, that D. Reyn. might have observed another use of these books, *viz.* that now, by the testimony of the Priests themselves, her late Majestie, and the State were cleared of that imputation of putting Papists to death, for their consciences only, and for their religion, seeing in those books, they themselves confesse, that they were executed for treason. D. Reyn. excused himself, expounding his complaint, not meant of such books, as had been printed in England, but such as came from beyond the seas, as commentaries both in philosophy and divinity."—*Ib.* 51.

[1] "Somewhat was here spoken by the Lord Chancellor, of livings rather wanting learned men, than learned men livings: many in the universities pining, maisters, batchelors, and upwardes; wishing therefore, that some might haue single coats, before other had dublets: and here his L. shewed the course that he had ever taken in bestowing the Kinges benefices. My Lord of London commending his honourable care that way, withall excepted, that a dublet was necessary in cold weather. The L. Chancellor replied, that he did it not for dislike of the liberty of our Church in granting one man 2 benefices, but out of his own private practice and purpose grounded upon the foresaid reason."—*Ib.* 57.

largely to the want of selection by lay patrons: an evil above episcopal control, legal qualifications for a benefice being low, and a *Quare impedit* deterring bishops from insisting upon more. The Apocrypha, he said, was useful for moral instruction, though not for articles of faith. Baptismal interrogations he justified from St. Austin, the sign of a cross by other significant usages, as kneeling, knocking the breast, and raising the hands in prayer.

Overall, dean of St. Paul's, taught that justification was effectually, though not finally lost, by a relapse into sin. Such a fall did not even totally deprive the party of God's grace, but he needed a new repentance, in order to recover his former condition. Some, however, denied any loss of justification at all, where it had been once truly received. Let subsequent iniquity be what it might, the sinner continued just before God, and sudden death, or forgetfulness to repent, would be found no bar to salvation. Three of the other deans took part in defence of the ceremonies, chiefly by scholarly appeals to antiquity.

The king expressed a dislike to rash dealing with the doctrine of predestination; on one side, was the danger of questioning God's omnipotence, on the other, of encouraging a desperate presumption in individuals. The alleged discrepancy between the Articles, and the Confirmation-service, he dismissed as a mere cavil. To episcopacy he declared an unalterable attachment, closing his testimony in its favour, by bluntly exclaiming, *No bishop, no king*. When Reynolds expressed himself dissatisfied with a bare disclaimer of the pope's authority, proposing, *nor ought to have*, as an addition, he burst out into a hearty laugh. The courtiers, of course, found this infectious. Some of them then helped him to a little more mirth, by deriding the Puritan objections as idle and frivolous, reminding them of a Cambridge man, who pronounced *a Puritan, a Protestant frayed out of his wits.* The opening thus given to banter, was unfortunate for the credit of James. His natural disposition for drollery became irresistible, and hurried him into occasional sallies, little suited to the time, and resented ever since, as gross insults. The doctrine of ministerial intention, led him to pun upon the intentions of Dr. Reynolds and his friends[1]. The cross in baptism was to be forborne, on account of weak brethren, yet "some of them were strong enough, if not headstrong," and in spite of pretences to weakness, really thought themselves able to teach him, with all the bishops. The churching of women, he thought quite desirable, their sex being so little fond of coming to church, that anything to draw them thither must have his approbation. The *prophesyings* and proposed reference of questions to diocesan synods, made him say, "They are aiming at a Scottish presbytery: which agrees as well with monarchy, as God with devil. Then meet Jack, and Tom, and Will, and Dick, to censure at their pleasures, me, and my council, and all our proceedings. Up stands Will, and says, *It must be so: Nay, marry,* follows Dick, *we will have it thus.* Therefore, I must say again, *Le Roy s'avisera.* Pray, stay one seven years before you ask me this. If you then find me fat and pursy, with my windpipe stuffed, I may, perhaps, hearken to you. Let that government once be up, and I am sure to be kept in breath. We shall all have work enough; both our hands full. So, Dr. Reynolds, till you find me grow lazy, let that alone[1]."

---

[1] "Because you speake of *Intention*, sayth his Highnesse, I will apply it thus, If you come hither with a good intention to be informed and satisfied where you shall find just cause, the whole work will sort to the better effect; but if your intention bee to goe as you came (whatsoever shall be sayd) it will prove that the intention is very materiall and essentiall to the ende of this present action."—BARLOW. 40.

From such language it is plain, that Scotland was below the average of contemporary civilisation. While, however, James was thus playing the buffoon, most of his remarks did honour to his understanding and information. To the Lambeth Articles, he objected as enunciating theological conclusions, fit for discussion in universities, not to swell the terms of national communion. As might be expected, he was quite at home upon predestination and reprobation. But he pronounced it hypocrisy, not real, justifying faith, which was uncombined with repentance, and holiness of life. Of some new catechetical instruction for popular use, he spoke with approbation, but it ought to be conveyed in the fewest and plainest affirmative terms that may be found[2]. The call for a new translation of the Bible, he admitted, none of those already provided being satisfactory, especially the Genevan: but he would suffer no marginal notes[3], warned by that particular translation, which had some teaching politics, of a very exceptionable kind[4]. Against the rejection of things merely because they had been abused by Papists, he argued, that even the Trinity might be rejected upon such ground. He would retort popish charges of novelty, by fixing them upon their own corruptions, which alone were liable to the censure. By objections to the surplice, as worn by the priests of Isis, he professed himself surprised, having hitherto heard it scornfully designated *a rag of Popery*[1]. But this new reason for its rejection was particularly weak, there being no nations of conterminous heathens, who might receive encouragement from its continuance. Nor was it enough to connect things with Popery in order to condemn them. Departure from Rome had no occasion to be wider, than her own departure from herself, during the time of her purity. By the words *With my body, I thee worship*, he had once been made to believe, that some sort of divine worship was intended, but he now found Englishmen generally speaking of a *gentlemen of worship*, and that the matrimonial office meant no more than to exact a promise of *giving honour to the wife*[2]. The royal supremacy had been twice mentioned incidentally by Dr. Reynolds, as concerned in the questions under discussion, but James denied any prospect of securing it by puritanical means. In Scotland, his grandmother, the queen-regent, had been told by the reformed preachers, that it was vested in the crown, as long as the Popish prelacy retained hold upon the country, but that body was no sooner overthrown, than ecclesiastical supremacy was wholly usurped by the presbytery. That such principles had made way into England, he had found since his arrival, some of the preachers praying for him as sovereign, but omitting to add, *supreme governor, in all causes, and over all persons as well ecclesiastical as civil.* It is impossible that any sovereign who had not been educated carefully amid the din of theological controversy, could have been ready with so many pertinent, and even scholarly remarks, upon such an occasion. His courtiers took care to be in raptures. Cecil, who was working upwards by services really valuable, thought them likely to be rendered more effective by some well-timed flattery. He acknowledged England very much bound to God, for the gift of a king with *an understanding heart.* The chancellor naturally thought of his law-books in framing a compliment. He had often heard and read, that *Rex est mixta persona cum sacerdote.* Never till to-day, had he seen the truth of this. Another courtly sycophant, who, probably, could seek no selfish ends, by means of useful services, or

---

[1] Barlow. 79.

[2] "Taxing withall the number of ignorant Catechismes set out in Scotland, by everie one that was the sonne of a good man: insomuch as that which was catechisme doctrine in one congregation, was in another scarcely accepted as sound and orthodox."—*Ib.* 44.

[3] "Upon a word cast out by my Lord of London."—*Ib.* 46.

[4] "As for example, *Exod.* i. 19. where the marginall note alloweth disobedience to kings: and 2 *Chron.* xv. 16. the note taxeth Asa for deposing his mother onely, and not killing her."—*Ib.* 47.

---

[1] James appears to have gone farther than the mention of this designation, so ordinarily fitted upon the surplice. Sir John Harington says, "I must write my newes to my poor wyfe. The bishops came aboute the petition of the Puritans. I was by, and heard much dyscourse: the Kynge talked much Latin, and disputed with Dr. Reynoldes at Hampton, but he rather used upbraidinges than argumente, and told the petitioners that they wanted to strip Christe againe, and bid them awaie with their snivellinge; moreover, he wishede those who would take awaie the surplice, might want linen for their own breech." (*Nugæ Antiquæ*. ii. 228.) It has been observed that Harington must be an unexceptionable witness, because he was unfavourable to the Puritans. But he was at least equally so to James, and it is not clear that he actually heard the vulgar language attributed to him.

[2] This ancient form of espousal, the immemorial usage of England, came again under notice on the third day. "A little disputing there was about the wordes of marriage, *With my body I thee worship*, and arguing no other to be meant, by the word *worship* then that which St. Paul willeth (1 Cor. vii. 4) the man thereby acknowlėdging that hereby he worshippeth his wife, in *that he appropriateth his body unto her alone:* nor any more then that

---

which S. Peter counselleth (1 Pet. iii. 7) *That the man should give honour to his wife, as to the weaker vessel:* yet for their satisfaction should be put in, *With my body I thee worship and honour,* if it were thought fit." (Barlow. 97.) This explanatory addition seems not to have been "thought fit:" thus Englishmen are still married with the very same words that were their forefathers in every age, and cavillers may still shew their malicious ignorance in representing them under a solemn promise to make idols of their wives.

receive any direction from professional acquirements, blasphemously declared a full persuasion, that his majesty spoke by the *instinct of the Spirit of God*[1]. This most indecent folly, or rather the prelatical echo of it, figures ordinarily in the fore-ground of Hampton-court pictures, the composition besides, being chiefly supplied by the royal moderator's own jokes and violence[2]. But such treatment is every way unfair. Prelacy merely followed a bad example, and however inexcusably James occasionally behaved himself, his general conduct shewed him quite equal to the post which he was called upon to fill.

The third and final meeting was on the following Wednesday: when the alterations agreed-upon were proposed. The term, *absolution*, was to be qualified by an explanation, lay baptism to be forbidden, examination to be connected indispensably with confirmation, and a Scriptural inaccuracy to be corrected[1]. The Puritan representatives had deprecated schism, from the first, and they professed satisfaction at these concessions. Besides proposing them, James entered largely upon the practice of the high commission and ecclesiastical courts, defending, among other things, with considerable skill, the oath *ex officio*. A discerning mind might have seen an inherent rottenness in this, from the eagerness that hailed its royal advocate's exertions. On Monday, James had occasionally forgotten himself, the prelates and deans, abating Bancroft's heat, never. Now the scene was most painfully reversed. There was no royal buffoonery. But prelacy was found infected by the worst examples of Monday's courtly sycophancy, and indelibly disgraced. Whitgift defiled his aged lips, by saying that his majesty spoke undoubtedly by the special aid of God's Spirit[2].

---

[1] "And this was the summe of the second dayes conference, which raysed such an admiration in the Lordes, in respect of the King his singular readines and exact knowledge, that one of them saide, hee was fully perswaded his Majestie spake by the *instinct of the spirite of God*."—BARLOW. 83.

[2] "The king it must be confessed, from the beginning of the conference, shewed the strongest propensity to the established church, and frequently inculcated a maxim, which, though it has some foundation, is to be received with great limitations, *No bishop, no king*. The bishops, in their turn, were very liberal in their praises towards the royal disputant, and the archbishop of Canterbury said, that *undoubtedly, his Majesty spake by the special assistance of God's spirit*." (HUME.) Miss Aikin cites the passage from Harington, used in the next page, which mentions the bishops talking of the king as inspired, and subsequently says, "Archbishop Whitgift, that strenuous high-churchman, who, on hearing the ecclesiastical commission, and especially the *ex officio* oath defended by James, had exclaimed in a kind of rapture, *that his Majesty spoke by the special assistance of God's spirit*." (*Memoirs of the Court of King James the First*. Lond. 1822. i. 178. 181.) Mr. Price (*Hist. Nonconf.* i. 467.) has adopted the latter of these passages, almost without alteration. Now, how far Whitgift's weakness in paying this absurd and blasphemous compliment, may be extenuated by its origin from a lay courtier, need not be discussed, but the fact should be stated.

---

[1] "The next scruple against subscription was that old *Crambe bis posita*, that in the Common Prayer Booke, it is twise set downe, *Jesus said to his Disciples*, when as by the text originall it is plain, that he spake to the Pharisees. To which it was aunswered, that for aught that could appeare by the places, hee might speake as well to his disciples, they being present, as to the Pharisees. But his Majestie keeping an even hand, willed that the word *Disciples*, should bee omitted, and the wordes *Jesus said*, to bee printed in a different letter, that it might appeare not to bee a part of the text." (BARLOW. 63.) "Jesus *said to them*, twise to be put into the *Dominicall* Gospels, instead of *Jesus said to his Disciples*."—Third day's Conference.—*Ib.* 86.

[2] *Ib.* 93.—"The bishops seemed much pleased, and said his Majestie spoke by the power of inspiration; I wist not what they mean, but the spirit was rather foulemouthede. I cannot be present at the next meetinge, though the Bishope of London said I myghte be in the anti-chamber: it seemeth the Kynge will not change the religious observances. There was muche discourse aboute the rynge in marriage, and the crosse in baptisme, but if I guesse aryghte, the petitioners againste one crosse, wyll finde another." (HARINGTON. *Nugæ Antiquæ*. ii. 228.) Mr. Hallam considers Harington "the best evidence of James's beha-

Bancroft protested on his knee, that his heart melted with joy. This was merely ridiculous and base. But he profanely crowned his degradation, by acknowledging to God, as a singular mercy, the gift of such a king, as he thought, had never been since our Saviour's time. He might have stooped thus low from the slavery of ambition, often an overmatch for the sound principles even of virtuous men. The primate was above such bondage. He had long stood upon the summit of professional success, and an attack of his old enemy, the jaundice, in December[1], must have made him feel himself on the very edge of another world. Sinking health, faculties ruined, and overdone anxiety for the Church, may fairly ask him some excuse: but, notwithstanding, such an appearance at such a time, reads a most humiliating lesson to human nature.

Besides these corrections in the public service, the version of Scripture yet in use, and the latter part of the Catechism, explanatory of the sacraments[2], flowed from

---

viour." (*Const. Hist.* i. 404. note.) He certainly seems to be the favourite evidence, but his accuracy is open to doubt. It does not appear from Barlow, that any bishop spoke of the King's inspiration, on Monday, when alone Harington was present. Whitgift's discreditable fall into this offensive sycophancy, was on Wednesday, when the relator says, "I cannot be present." He seems, in fact, to have had no opportunity of being present in any better place than the ante-chamber; which, probably, was his position, on Monday. If so, he was not likely to hear quite perfectly, and the whole account might be made up from his own insufficient observation, and the accounts of others, after the Conference was closed, on Wednesday. He might not unreasonably think such a degree of accuracy sufficient for a private communication to his wife: which is the real nature of his evidence. Barlow's stands on very different grounds. It was the careful report of a dignified clergyman, meant for publication.

[1] STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 505.

[2] "The primitive catechisms (*i. e.* all that the Catechumens were to learn by heart before their baptism and confirmation) consisted of no more than the *Renunciation*, or the repetition of the baptismal

the Hampton-court conference. It was, therefore, very far from the fruitless mockery of just expectations which has often passed for its real character. On the contrary, every objection, really found tenable, met a suitable remedy; and a discussion that left the Church of England very much as we now find it, proved how little ground of exception could be taken to its formularies by scholarly and moderate men[1]. Even the surplice, which the

---

vow, the *Creed*, and the *Lord's Prayer:* and these with the Ten Commandments, at the Reformation, were the whole of ours. But it being afterwards thought defective as to the doctrine of the Sacraments (which in primitive times were more largely explained to baptized persons) King James I. appointed the bishops to add a short and plain explanation of of them; which was done, accordingly, in that excellent form we see; being penned by Bishop Overall, the dean of St. Paul's, and allowed by the bishops. So that now, in the opinion of the best judges, it excels all catechisms that ever were in the world; being so short, that the youngest children may learn it by heart, and yet so full that it contains all things necessary to be known in order to salvation."—WHEATLY. 382.

[1] James appears to have been surprised by the fewness and unimportance of the objections urged. On Monday, "as hee was going to his inner chamber, If this bee al, quoth he, that they have to say, I shall make them conforme themselves, or I will harrie them out of the land, or else doe worse." (BARLOW. 83.) This arbitary coarseness was foolish enough, but it shews disappointed expectation of a stronger case. The same thing may be collected from another specimen of royal ill-breeding, conceit, and indiscretion, directed to some unknown Scottish correspondent, named Blake. "We have kept such a revell with the Puritans here this two days, as was never heard the like: quhaire I have peppered thaime as soundlie, as yee have done the Papists thaire. It were no reason, that those that will refuse the airy sign of the cross after baptism, should have their purses stuffed with any more solid and substantial crosses. They fled me so from argument to argument, without ever answering me directly, *ut est eorum moris*, as I was forced at last to say unto thaime; that if any of thaime had been in a college disputing with thair scholars, if any of thair disciples had answered them in that sort, they would have fetched him up in place of a reply; and so should the rod have plyed upon the poor boyes buttocks. I have such a book of thaires as may well convert infidels, but it shall never convert me, except by turning me more earnestly against thayme."—STRYPE. *Whitgift*. iii. 408.

Puritan representatives branded as an adoption from the priests of Isis, has long ceased to arouse antipathy in any quarter. Not only does the Calvinistic party, within the Church, really the successor of Elizabethan Puritanism, wear it contentedly, but also a similar body of Dissenters voluntarily follows the example. Thus experience has proved it needless to consult unsubstantial scruples.

James has been thought to have thrown away at Hampton-court an invaluable opportunity for healing the religious wounds of England[1]. But nothing was likely to be gained by opening a wide field for debate. The more violent Puritans could be expected to require no less than an absolute surrender of the Establishment. Until episcopacy was overthrown, and the consistorian system raised upon its ruins, the Gospel must still, according to their doctrine, have been fatally curtailed of its full integrity. Nor could even a sweeping alteration like this have given general satisfaction to opponents of the hierarchy. Of the Brownists, little or nothing had long been heard. They were not, however, extinct. Consistorian platforms might seem, to such as had a prospect of importance under them, and to many besides, the perfection of ecclesiastical discipline. To a large proportion of those who saw no chance of anything but obedience, or who were otherwise averse from such arrangements, they would appear just as tyrannical and intolerable as the reprobated episcopacy, or even as Popery itself. Such opinions were certain to come forward in the ordinary course of events, but their growth must have been violently forced, if Presbytery were legally to knock at every man's door in the tone of a master. Brownism would immediately and fiercely dispute its authority.

---

[1] Hallam. i. 403.

As, therefore, it was deemed advisable to hear and consider the grounds of religious dissatisfaction, prudence required a judicious selection of the parties to state them. With a few individuals of high character, headed by such a man as Reynolds, there was a hope of treating satisfactorily[1]. A debate with men of less eminence, and of

---

[1] Reynolds, originally fellow of Corpus Christi College, had been tutor there to Hooker. He resigned his fellowship in 1586, being appointed lecturer in controversial divinity, with a stipend of 20*l.* a year, provided by Sir Francis Walsingham. He then removed to Queen's College, and resided there several years. (KEBLE'S *Hooker*. i. 137.) His great reputation seems to have been thought but barely supported at Hampton-court. "It is generally said, that herein, he" (James,) "went above himself, that the Bishop of London appeared even with himself, and that Dr. Reynolds fell much beneath himself. Others observed that Archbishop Whitgift spake most gravely, Bancroft (when out of passion) most politicly, Bilson most learnedly. And of the divines, Mr. Reynolds most largely, Knewstubbs most affectionately, Chadderton most sparingly. In this scene, onely Dr. Sparks was *ἄφρων πρόσωπον*, making use of his hearing, not speech, converted (it seems) to the truth of what was spoken, and soon after setting forth a treatise of *Unity and Uniformity*.

"But the Nonconformists complained that the king sent for their divines, not to have their scruples satisfied, but his pleasure propounded; not that he might know what they could say, but they, what he would do in the matter. Besides, no wonder if Dr. Reynolds a little lost himself, whose eyes were partly dazzled with the light of the king's majesty, partly daunted with the heat of his displeasure. Others complain that this conference is partially set forth only by Dr. Barlow, dean of Chester, their professed adversary, to the great disadvantage of their divines. And when the Israelites go down to the Philistines to whet all their iron tools, no wonder if they set a sharp edge on their own, and a blunt one on their enemies' weapons." (FULLER. B. x. p. 21.)

The first reports, however, of the Conference, raised Puritan hopes. People said that James had gratified Reynolds in everything; that the concessions obtained, were but the beginnings of reformation, the preludes to matters of more importance; that Bancroft had, indeed, called Reynolds a schismatic, for which he thanked him, but spoke otherwise very little to the purpose; that Bilson said hardly any thing; that the king was very hard upon the bishops, but embraced Reynolds, and addressed him in the kindest manner; that either the archbishop, or the bishop of London, on his knees, besought the king to take their cause into his hands, discordant opinions, could only have ended in confusion and increased irritation.

Although the conference terminated satisfactorily. Archbishop Whitgift's uneasiness was merely lightened. Parliament was soon to meet, and spirits undermined by his illness in December, made him dread the House of Commons[1]. To be sufficiently prepared for any movement there, he went, under an appointment with some of the prelacy, and leading civilians, to the Bishop of London's, at Fulham. He used his barge, according to custom: it was a February day of extraordinary coldness. His attendants, with youth on their side, shivered before the wintry blast, and would fain have broken it off by letting down the barge-cloth. But the archbishop's practice had been to keep it up, and he was the less willing now to do otherwise, because the water was rough, and he wished to see his way. It was, however, a fatal adherence to customary usage. At night he complained of a severe cold. Still he saw no reason to

---

and to bring about such an issue as might save their credit.—BARLOW.

[1] Barlow was chosen by Whitgift to publish an account of the Hampton-court conference, and speaking in his preface of the delay in its appearance, he says, that one reason was "his untimely death, who first imposed it upon me, with whome is buried the famousest glory of our English Church, and the most kind incouragement to paines and study: a man happie in his life and death, loved of the best while he lived, and hearde of God for his decease; most earnestly desiring, not many dayes before he was stroken, that he might not yet live to see this Parliament, as neare as it was." Cambden also says, "Whilst the king began to find fault with some things used in the Liturgy, and thought it convenient that they should be altered, John Whitgift, the archbishop, died for grief." (*Annals of King James I.*) "There was a Directory drawn up by the Puritans, prepared to be offered to the next parliament; which, in all probability, would have created a good deal of disturbance in the House, having many favourers there; which paper the aged archbishop was privy to, and was very apprehensive of."—STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 506.

apprehend any serious seizure, and accordingly, on the following Sunday, the first in Lent, he went, as usual, to wait upon the king. Both before and after chapel, he had a long conversation with the Bishop of London, and thus the cravings of nature were wholly disregarded. But this was no longer safe. He had fasted until near one o'clock, and then going from the king to dine in the council-chamber, he was attacked by palsy. Having suffered under that malady before[1], he might, excusably, have been more sparing of himself. The chancellor and the Bishop of London, assisted by some of the royal servants, carried him immediately into the lord treasurer's room. Thence he was promptly conveyed across the water to Lambeth. On the following Tuesday, James came over to visit him, and spoke in the kindest manner, declaring his recovery of great importance to himself. The archbishop was evidently much gratified, and made an effort to speak, but nothing could be understood besides the words, *pro Ecclesia Dei*, which he uttered several times. After the king was gone, even this imperfect articulation ceased, and the dying prelate made signs for writing-materials. When brought, he found himself quite unable to handle the pen, and sighing deeply, he quietly lay down again. On Wednesday evening, at eight o'clock, he passed without a struggle out of life[2]. His chaplains had been with him, employed upon devotional exercises, from the first, and it was evident to all around, that holy feelings within cordially gave that response which the lips denied. He was in the seventy-fourth year of his age[3].

His primacy extended over more than twenty eventful years. It opened with a Church reeling under vigorous and combined assaults, to build a consistorian despotism on its ruins. When it closed, popular ardour for this cherished *platform* was most materially cooled. Some of the Disciplinarian leaders had been removed by death, others, chilled by age, were merely seen as exemplary candidates for a better world. Their scheme, too, had no longer the charm of novelty, and numerous exposures of its weak points had lost it innumerable partisans. Whitgift himself, however, was largely instrumental in saving England from a democratical pontificate. His early exertions as a scholar, shook Cartwright's authority when at its height, and his able services as archbishop of Canterbury, repressed a disposition to live by the Church, and undermine it all the while. In exacting this needful honesty, Whitgift exhibited a never-failing courage, but alloyed with no unnecessary harshness. He discharged a difficult and painful task with acknowledged moderation[1].

---

[1] HARINGTON. *Nugæ Antiquæ*. i. 10.

[2] Feb. 29.

[3] PAULE. 121.

---

[1] Stowe. 835. "The errors which we seek to reform in this kind of men, are such as both received at your hands their first wound, and from that time to the present have been proceeded in with that moderation, which useth by patience to suppress boldness, and to make them conquer that suffer." (Hooker. Dedication to Archbishop Whitgift. *Eccl. Pol.* B. 5. Keble's Ed. ii. 3.) "Though the Archbishop was in this singular favour and grace with her Majesty, so that he did all in all for the managing of clergy-affairs, and disposing of bishoprics, and other ecclesiastical promotions, yet was he never puffed up with pride, nor did any thing violently, by reason of his place, and greatness with her Majesty, against any man. For he ever observed this rule, that he would not wound, where he could not salve. And I leave it to the report of the adversaries themselves, when he had that sway in government, and favour with her Highness, whether his carriage were not exceeding mild and temperate, and whether he did not endeavour rather by gentle persuasions and kind usages to win them, than (as the law and his place required) to pronounce sentence, or lay any sharp censure upon them. Hath he not, many a time, when sentence had been ready to be given by consent of all the commissioners, found some

His temper was naturally hasty, but Christian principles kept it effectually in check, and he was habitually kind[1]. Thus the severities to which he necessarily became a party, never lost him the general esteem of his contemporaries. He was too well known as magnanimous and liberal[2]. His

occasion to delay the sentence to another court-day, and in the mean time so plied the delinquents, and set on others to persuade them, as thereby many of them were won, which otherwise never would have been brought unto conformity?" (PAULE. 79.) "It was truly noted in him by a great counsellor in the Star Chamber, when Pickering was there censured for libelling against him after his death, *That there was nothing more to be feared in his government* (*especially toward his latter time*) *than his mildness and clemency.*"—*Ibid.* 80.

[1] *Ibid.* 108.

[2] "Cartwright, the distinguished antagonist of Whitgift, expired a short time before him. He died Dec. 27, 1603, aged sixty-eight years. His published works were numerous, and his confutation of the Rhemist translation of the New Testament, published after his death, greatly extended his fame. He had been urged by several parties to undertake this work. Sir Francis Walsingham sent him one hundred pounds towards the purchase of such books as he might require. Several of the doctors and heads of houses, at Cambridge, united in a letter earnestly calling him to this work, as did also many ministers in London and Suffolk. With these requests he complied, and had made some progress in the work, when the suspicious Whitgift, jealous of the honour his antagonist might thus obtain, interdicted his proceeding any farther." (PRICE. i. 471. note.) "No sooner had Whitgift gotten notice what Cartwright was a writing, but presently he prohibited his farther proceeding therein. It seems Walsingham was secretary of State, not of Religion, wherein the Archbishop overpowered him. Many commended his care, not to intrust the defence of the doctrine of England to a pen so disaffected to the discipline thereof. Others blamed his jealousie to deprive the Church of so learned pains of him, whose judgement would so solidly, and affections so zealously confute the common adversary. Distastfull passages, shooting at Rome, but glancing at Canterbury, if any such were to be found in his book, might be expunged, whilest it was pity so good fruit should be blasted in the bud for some bad leaves about it. Disheartened hereat, Cartwright desisted; but some years after, encouraged by a honourable lord, resumed the work; but prevented by death, perfected no farther than the fifteenth chapter of the *Revelation.* Many years lay this worthy work neglected, and the copy thereof mouse-eaten in part, whence the printer excused some

professional elevation was the honourable prize of ascertained competence. As a controversialist, he grappled successfully with principles then highly popular, but which no man any longer defends, from their undeniable hostility to civil and religious liberty. Being unmarried, he had no temptation to hoard for others, and his domestic expenditure ever bore an imposing port of feudal magnificence[1]. He was, however, no thoughtless waster of

---

defects therein in his edition; which, though late, yet at last came forth, *Anno* 1618. A book, which, notwithstanding the foresaid defects, is so compleat, that the Rhemists durst never return the least answer thereunto." (Fuller. B. 9. p. 171.) While the work remained incomplete and in MS., it seems to have been loudly praised by the Disciplinarians, and represented by their opponents as unprinted, because unfit for examination. Sutcliffe says, "*Quære*, of those that make braggs of T. Cartw. great worke against the Rhemists, whether there be not many points therein conteined contrary to all the Fathers, to the faith of the Church, and all good divinitie? And why, if all bee cleere with him, he dare not suffer the same to abide the censures of lerned men? And lastly, why any should wonder that such thinges should not be published, considering what dangerous effects doe follow printing of hereticall and schismaticall bookes?" (*An Answere to certaine calumnious petitions, articles, and questions of the Consistorian Faction.* 206.) Walsingham's liberal overtures to Cartwright were in 1583. The applications made to him from Cambridge were all of his own party there; as the signed Latin epistle before the published book shews. The applications from the London and Suffolk ministers were suppressed "for some personal and special reasons." They are not likely to have come from any other than well-known Disciplinarians. Without casting any unworthy imputations upon the archbishop, he might merely look upon the projected work as bidding fair to be found a blind for disseminating Cartwright's peculiar opinions. He might also look upon holders of such opinions as unsuited for the Romish controversy. Experience, undoubtedly, has shewn that papal polemics fix upon the principles of *ultra*-Protestantism, and treat them as if common to all who dissent from Rome.

[1] "While he was bishop of Worcester, though the revenew of that be not very great, yet his custom was to come to the Parliament very well attended, which was a fashion the Queen liked exceedingly well. It happened one day, Bishop Elmer, of London, meeting this bishop with such an orderly troop of tawny coats, and demanding of him how he could keep so many men, he answered, it was by reason he kept so few

an ample revenue. Learning owed much to his liberal and discerning patronage. Charitable calls ever found

women." (HARINGTON. *Nugæ Antiquæ.* i. 9.) Aylmer had no money for such display, being a married man successfully intent upon founding a family. "Every third year he went into Kent, unless great occasions hindered him, where he was so honourably attended-upon by his own train, consisting of two hundred persons, and with the gentlemen of the county, that he did sometimes ride into the city of Canterbury, and into other towns, with eight hundred or a thousand horse. And surely, the entertainment which he gave them, and they him, was so great, that, as I am verily persuaded, no shire in England did, or could, give greater, or with more chearful minds to each other." (PAULE. 104.) "At his first journey into Kent, he rode into Dover, being attended with an hundred of his own servants, at least, in livery, whereof there were forty gentlemen in chains of gold. The train of clergy and gentlemen in the country, and their followers, was about five hundred horse. At his entrance into the town, there happily landed an intelligencer from Rome of good parts and account, who wondered to see an archbishop, or clergyman in England so well attended." (*Ibid.* 105.) These accounts have given rise to invidious remarks: but it should be remembered that Whitgift's household was that of great persons in his day; that his train, upon visitations, was increased three, four, or five fold, by no members of his establishment, but by such as came from duty or respect, and as were to be entertained at his expense; and that a time which knew nothing of standing armies, and had no better *police* than a scattered body of common constables, required individuals to retain about them some means of defence proportioned to their several stations. "He kept likewise for the exercise of military discipline, a good armoury, and a fair stable of great horses: insomuch as he was able to arm at all points, both horse and foot, and divers times had one hundred foot, and fifty horse, of his own servants mustered and trained; for which purpose, he entertained captains." (*Ibid.* 97.) Whitgift had thought favourably of Essex, and often expressed himself so to the queen, when her own opinions were turning the other way, and she heard his intercessions impatiently. "Within a while after, the Earl, forgetting that unto princes the highest judgement of things is given, and unto us the glory of obedience is left, went out indeed. The Archbishop, being that Sunday morning at the court, (whether by direction, or by his own accord, I know not,) hastened home without any attendant, and commanded as many men as he then had in the house to be presently armed, and sent them over to the court, but not to go within the gates until Master Secretary Cecill, or some other, by his instruction, should appoint them a leader. There were immediately presented unto him equally a careful steward, and a ready dispenser of abundance[1]. His royal patroness, delighted with a

---

him threescore men well armed, and appointed, who, with a message from the archbishop, shewed themselves before the court, of whose arrival there Master Secretary Cecill, with the rest of the lords of the council, were right glad, and said he was a most worthy prelate. They had speedily a leader appointed unto them, and marched presently, and were the first that entered into the gates of Essex House; and in the first court made good the place, until the Earl yielded himself, and was by the Lord Admiral brought to Lambeth House, where he remained an hour or two, and was from thence conveyed to the Tower. The archbishop had likewise in readiness, that afternoon, forty horsemen, well appointed, and expected directions from the court how to dispose of them. The next morning he sent a gentleman to know how the queen did, and how she rested all night. To whom she made answer, that she rested and slept the better for his care the day before: 'but I beshrew his heart,' said she, 'he would not believe this of Essex, though I had often told him it would, one day, thus come to pass.'" (*Ibid.* 94.) It is obvious, that a time in which the sovereign was thus defenceless, and first found relief from the resources of a private establishment, bears no analogy to the present day. Elizabeth's own taste in such a case might not be her only reason for approving the archbishop's magnificent household. She might view it as likely to be useful in an emergency. It was also a refutation of slanders upon English Protestantism current abroad among Romanists. The "intelligencer from Rome," who saw Whitgift at Dover, was astonished, and said that the English fugitives had greatly blinded the papal court. It was, no doubt, often represented, that Englishmen had only made an outcry for reformation, in order to pillage the Church. Foreigners in England had an opportunity, from an establishment like Whitgift's, of seeing that such representations were, in a great measure, unfounded. As for the impropriety of a large retinue, with a clerical master, however called-for by the habits and necessities of the age, it is not very clear that the revenues of Canterbury, confiscated to swell the rent-rolls of private families, and keeping long trains of "tawny coats" for them, would have been any real improvement. There is no reason why clergymen should be chained down to hopeless inferiority, and thus a whole profession be liable to that insolence which pride has always in store for poverty. Besides, as ecclesiastics ordinarily come from moderate or humble stations, the admission of some few among them to the gratifications of superior life, really strengthens the hereditary possessors of such, by widening the interest felt in them.

[1] He not only kept habitually a watchful eye over the necessities of his neighbours, and did innu-

prelate every way so much to her taste, and so thoroughly worthy of esteem, regarded him with unfailing friendship, and was frequently his guest. But Whitgift, even when ambition had yet a field before it, would not stoop to poison her mind, and compromise his own integrity, by unworthy flattery. Though the powerful Leicester had gained her consent to projects of ecclesiastical pillage, he remonstrated with a boldness hardly to be expected from an age in which rank, especially the royal, usually met with more than servile deference[1]. In reli-

---

merable acts of liberality at a distance, but also he founded an hospital and a free-school at Croydon, permanent witnesses to the faithfulness of his pecuniary stewardship. In this hospital, he often dined "among his poor brethren, as he called them." (PAULE. 112.) "Upon some chief festival-days, he was served with great solemnity, sometime upon the knee, as well for the upholding of the state that belonged unto his place, as for the better education and practice of his gentlemen and attendants in point of service." (*Ibid.* 103.) A repast, at one time, with attendants kneeling, at another with paupers in an hospital, shews the man, and shews the age. Had Whitgift been solely swayed by pride, he would have found hospital meals intolerably irksome, and modern times would have thought them utterly inconsistent with the stately banquets in which occasionally he appeared. But these latter were truly exhibitions, in which the primate was to be gazed-at, surrounded by formalities, usual in his day, where the station was elevated. We learn, also, that one of his objects in retaining this antiquated state, was to make his attendants familiar with it, so that another service, where it might be required, would find them perfectly prepared.

[1] His speech is preserved in WALTON'S *Life of Hooker.* (i. 52. Keble's Ed.) He was then bishop of Worcester. Those who judge of him from his discreditable fall at Hampton Court, when worn-out by age, paralysis, and jaundice, would hardly suppose him capable of such a remonstrance. People of his own day knew better, and accordingly, Wilson, who wrote the life of James I., although a man of moderate religious principles, thus writes of James's language to the Puritan leaders. "The king managed his discourse with such power, (which they expected not from him, and therefore were more danted at,) that Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury, (though a holy, grave, and pious man,) highly pleased with it, with a sugred bait, (which princes are apt enough to swallow,) said, *He was verily perswaded, that the king spake by the Spirit of God.* This conference was on the 14th of January,

gion, Whitgift adopted Calvinistic views, general in his youth, and accordingly he lent himself to the Lambeth Articles. But his theological partialities betrayed him into no narrow prejudices against holders of more moderate opinions. Hence he secured the honour of patronising Hooker[1]. His religious profession was highly exemplary, and, unless when hindered by business, he was a constant preacher[2]. As a secular politician, the archbishop never appeared. At first, after his promotion to Canterbury, he was no member of the privy council, Leicester having exerted himself to prevent it. But when the favourite went over into the Low Countries, Whitgift was admitted at the council-board[3], and ever

---

and this good man expired the 29th of February following, in David's fullness of days, leaving a name like a sweet perfume behind him."—Kennett's *Hist. Engl.* ii. 665.

[1] "With regard to the points usually called Calvinistic, Hooker undoubtedly found the tone and language which has since come to be characteristic of that school, commonly adopted by those theologians to whom his education led him as guides and models; and therefore uses it himself as a matter of course, on occasions where no part of Calvinism comes expressly into debate. It is possible that this may cause him to appear to less profound readers, a more decided partisan of Calvin than he really was. At least, it is certain, that on the following subjects, he has avowed himself decidedly in favour of very considerable modifications of the Genevan theology. First, of election; the very ground of his original controversy with Travers, was his earnestly protesting in a sermon at the Temple, against irrespective predestination to death: a protest which he repeated in the *Ecclesiastical Polity*." (Keble. Pref. to *Hooker's Works.* c.) Other modifications, evidently levelled at the Lambeth Articles, follow.

[2] "When he was bishop of Worcester, unless extraordinary businesses of the Marches of Wales hindred him, he never failed to preach upon every sabbath-day; many times riding five or six miles to a parish-church, and after sermon, came home to dinner. The like he did when he was archbishop, and lay at Croydon, the queen being in her progress. No Sunday escaped him in Kent, as the gentlemen there can well witness, who would exceedingly resort unto him."—Paule. 87.

[3] "Whereat the Earl was not a little displeased." (*Ibid.* 49.) Archbishop Grindal never was a

afterwards attended regularly. He waited, however, only long enough to ascertain whether any ecclesiastical business might be expected. If he found none in preparation, he said, *Then, my lords, here is no need of me*, and immediately withdrew[1]. His memory, notwithstanding, has constantly been assailed by political animosity, no less than sectarian. The Disciplinarian platform, though seldom connected offensively with politics under Elizabeth, was really the first step towards that mighty movement which shipwrecked Charles I. Whitgift retarded its progress, and has never been forgiven, either by democratic partisans, or those who seek such for their tools. The resentment of Nonconformity naturally rises at his name. He was its active and uncompromising opponent. But his opposition can only be fastened on an abstract principle. He knew nothing of the dissenting body long seen in England. Whitgift's Nonconformists would have levied, if they could, a war of extermination against all who now pass under that comprehensive designation. Thus the enemies to his fame have sprung from parties posterior to his day, therefore never brought into collision with him. A lay contemporary, whom his generous love of literature had served, speaks of him as "a man born for the benefit of his country, and the good of the Church[2]." Another eminent layman, who knew him well, says that "he was a man of reverend and sacred memory; and of the primitive temper; a man of such a temper, as when the Church did flourish in highest examples of virtue[3]." Cambden says, that "he devoutly

---

privy-councillor.—FULLER. B. ix. p. 177.

[1] "A commendable practise, clearing himself from all aspersions of civill-pragmaticallness, and tending much to the just support of his reputation."—*Ibid.* 197.

[2] STOWE. 835.

[3] Sir Henry Wotton, in the

consecrated both his whole life to God, and his painful labours to the good of his Church[1]." Such testimonies from able, upright men, acquainted personally both with the archbishop and his time, allow very little value to party detraction from those who had no personal knowledge of either. A fair, though favourable churchman, within half a century of his death, was therefore fully justified in pronouncing him "one of the worthiest men that ever the English hierarchy did enjoy[2]."

During the whole period of Whitgift's public life, two great principles of national polity were steadily maintained. The settlement of religion, accomplished when he was a young man, was not to be disturbed, and but one religious profession was to be allowed. The former determination has long since been approved by the majority of Englishmen. The latter was almost equally popular in its day, though now it is universally reprobated, as unjust and impracticable. The sixteenth century, however, thought only of exclusive possession, and for it every party felt a conscientious call to struggle. All were quite unprepared, by experience, for toleration. There might even seem hardly any necessity for it in England. The nation had worn a Protestant appearance with little

---

Reliquiæ Wottonianæ. (KEBLE's *Hooker.* i. 49.) Such characters, from those who knew the man and his times, render the party violence that has assailed his memory of very little weight. It is not, however, wholly of modern date. Lewis Pickering published an attack upon him, treated as a libel in the Star Chamber, soon after his death, and subsequently Prynne made free with his character. Upon Sir Christopher Hatton's death, the queen would have made Whitgift chancellor; but he declined it. He had, however, when bishop of Worcester, been vice-president of the marches of Wales, Sir Henry Sidney, the lord deputy of Ireland, being lord president.—PAULE. 77. 31.

[1] "CAMBDEN's *Britannia*, translated by Holland, p. 338, ed. 1610."—KEBLE's *Hooker*. i. 50.

[2] FULLER. B. x. p. 25.

difficulty under Henry and Edward. Romish partialities could not fail of giving place, in many instances, to loathing and horror, under the frightful atrocities of Mary's reign. To these the clergy generally must have been considered more or less committed, and have thus declined in the people's love. They had naturally, too, some of that unpopularity which alloys the pleasure of possession. Many of them were opulent. Such men are always envied. Others, free from that objection, were, notwithstanding, independent enough to disappoint expectations of pecuniary advantage, or subserviency. Thus Elizabeth found a clergy possessed of very little influence, and which the country generally seemed quite willing to disregard. Even its cherished principles were rather unsettled. It held, indeed, opinions, now distinguishing the Church of Rome. But these had never been sufficiently authenticated, and were under actual examination. Such of the body as had been beneficed for any length of time, had shown a discreditable and suspicious pliancy of belief. Men smarting under public observation of this, were shamed out of any decided opposition to the queen's arrangements. Even if they chose to stand aloof themselves, they could hardly, with common decency, say much against the conformity of their friends and congregations. Thus they were divided as to the propriety and lawfulness of attending church[1].

---

[1] "*In the beginning also*, saith he, *of this Queene's dayes, the little affection which the laitie did beare unto the clergie, procured by some unquiet spirits, as also the small union of divers clergie men among themselves, some holding with the heretikes and politikes by heate of faction, was a great occasion of the totall overthrow of religion, whereupon also the same devill brought in the division of opinions about going to the hereticall churches and service, which most part of Catholikes did follow for many yeares: and when the better and truer opinion was taught them by priests and religi-*

It is probable that a negative judgment chiefly came from juniors among the discontented clergy; men, whom age had screened from much of recent inconsistencies, and whom warmer passions easily hurried into unsparing opposition. But although persons of their own standing overlook the peculiar circumstances of half-ripe counsellors, and see nothing in their warmth but a generous ardour; yet elder heads take full cognisance of both, and think but lightly of advice from such quarters. Beneficed clergymen, besides, however united by general views, have really few opportunities of intimate connexion with each other. A sudden change of position, therefore, like Elizabeth's adoption of Protestantism, would necessarily find them very ill prepared for acting in concert. The natural result of all these things, was a general appearance of acquiescence in the national abandonment of Romanism. It was impossible that individuals could be unaware of strong partiality to that system in many families. But still, there were very few known professors of it[1]. Statesmen, therefore, and observers generally,

---

ous men from beyond the seas, as more perfect and necessarie, there wanted not many that opposed themselves, especially of the elder sort of priests of Q. Maries dayes. And this division was not only favoured by the councell, but nourished also for many yeeres, by divers troublesome people of our owne, both in teaching and writing."—*A Reply to a notorious Libell, intituled,* A Briefe Apologie, &c. 69.

[1] "*For first,* sayth this good fellow, *how well manured and ripe the English Cath. harvest was 22 yeeres agoe, when the Jesuits were first sent, there being then but few priests in England, and having but one onely seminary untill that time, and fewe knowen Catholikes also, in respect of the number that after had ensued, this we say is knowen to all men that understand our case.* We are not here to stand upon the encrease of Catholikes which hath beene within these 22 yeeres: for no doubt there hath bene more knowen, then were before. And if the Jesuits will take it upon them, that they have bene greater encreasers of Catholikes than the Secular priests, they will discover in themselves too much both falsehood and vanitie."—*Ibid.* 22.

were justified in concluding that it must gradually and imperceptibly wear out, at no very great distance of time. Only forbid an open profession of it, and Romish prejudice, like Pagan, would soon sink into mere matter of history.

Elizabeth's advisers were naturally fortified in this opinion by the substantial failure of interference from abroad, when first tried in Romish houses. Their inhabitants were sufficiently assured of disapprobation to conformity, from quarters which they cordially respected: but, notwithstanding, domestic authorities demurred. Some of the priesthood, either secretly or openly Romish, came over at once to the propriety, or necessity, of refraining from church. Others could see nothing in the Trentine reasons, enforcing any such conclusion[1]. Thus the national public worship was not forsaken, even by many strongly prejudiced against it[2]. In a few years afterwards, this general conformity became a stumbling-block to Romish partisans. The Jesuits brought it forward as an evidence that some agency, like their own, was indispensable for recovering England. Had not the seculars been incompetent and remiss, the country never would have worn a face, during many years, all but completely Protestant. The seculars, on the other hand, insisted, that its altered aspect was really owing to themselves, and that Jesuitic detraction had given prominence, for its own ambitious ends, to a fact alike mortifying to Romanists, and injurious to their cause[1]. But, in truth, Romish conformity was too notorious and valuable in argument for pressing backward under any skill in tactics. To the queen's ministers, while continuing general, it necessarily seemed an irrefragable testimony to the soundness of their policy. It must also have betrayed them into an erroneous estimate of the secession which events ultimately produced. When absence from Protestant worship became a sectarian badge, it was also the handmaid of exasperated party-spirit. Hereditary rank, long deprived of influence, had been beaten and foiled in attempting to recover it by violence and treachery. The envied upstarts remained firmly in their seats, and had been driven to visit with severity those who sought, in arms or secret conclaves, to thrust them into their original obscurity. Their severities, too, naturally took that sweeping range, without which a stern and half-civilised age could not rest contented. Thus the smart of defeat reached more widely, and galled more intolerably, than actual occasion for it required. The same spirit, however, that appeared in this impolitic excess, would urge a continuance of its unrelenting efforts, as the soundest course for extinguishing a factious opposition.

---

[1] See note (1), p. 566.

[2] "It is also well knowen that Fa. Bosgrave, the Jesuite, at his first comming over into England, went to church, untill he understood, that now it was become a *signe distinctive*, and was excused for that fact by his ignorance of the then present state of our countrey: himselfe comming from such places, where it was not taken for so heinous a matter to go to the Protestant's church." (*A Reply to a notorious Libell*, &c. 70.) It is plain that this returned Jesuit was not likely to introduce any habit of going to church. It was general, when he left England, and it was by no means discontinued on his return. It was only, when he found abstinence from it grown into a badge of party, that he was under the necessity of pleading for excuse.

---

[1] "Omitting, therefore, what is here propounded to his Holinesse, concerning the Catholikes their going to the Protestants' churches, at the beginning of her Majesties raign, who now is (a thing which would not have bene published to the world by any who tendered their honour, unlesse there had bene some greater cause for it,) the subornation of some to poyson D. Allen (afterwards Cardinall) and the Students, and raising of sedition among the Catholikes beyond the sea, the evill successe which some had about the Queene of Scots, and divers Gentlemen, (which is here attributed to their secret keeping of their practises from Fa. Parsons and other,) the inducing of two Priests to write two bookes in favour of heretikes, as it were by reason of state, and to become spies, the one in France, the other in Spaine."—*A Reply to a notorious Libell*, &c. 40.

The birth of this might fairly seem almost entirely attributable to faction, and its arms furnished from no other arsenal. Boys were inveigled from their schools and families, into foreign seminaries, needy persons eagerly thought of them as a new resource; both were bound by oaths, and sent home again, as missionaries, chiefly among the discontented rich[1]. It was but yesterday, when their opinions were taught in every church, and the teachers lodged in every parsonage, installed in every cathedral. A revolution, or Elizabeth's demise, would place Mary of Scotland upon the throne, and probably, give preferment to those who thought with her in religion. It could hardly miss in such a case, the labourers in her cause, while depressed, and even dangerous. Whatever self-devotion might warm the returned Seminarist, it is im-

---

[1] "*Theo.* Do none flee the realme to come to your seminaries? *Phi.* They may flee that be persecuted. *Theo.* Doth the prince persecute children in grammer-schooles? *Phi.* That in conscience were too much. *Theo.* Yet you confesse, *Grammer scholers from al parts of the realme have yeelded you many youthes, and many (gentlemen's sonnes specially) adventure over to you without their parents' consent, and sometimes much against their wils.* And think you this lawful to entice children from their parents, and subjects from their prince, to be infected by you before they can judge of you? *Phi.* We do not entice them to come, but instruct them when they come. *Theo.* Remember you not, *your third purpose was to draw into these colleges, the best wittes out of England?* So that your own wordes convince you to be drawers, which is al one with enticers of boyes from their schooles, of children from their parents, and this I ween, you can hardly defend to be Catholike. Besides, *your purpose was to draw*, for this is your terme, *those that were desirous of exact education, or had scruple of conscience to take the oth of the Queenes supremacie, or that misliked to be forced to the ministerie, or that were doubtful whether of the two religions were true.* So that your seminaries be not only receits for such as be lightly touched by the lawes of this realme, but harbours for al that be desirous, scrupulous, dislikers, or doubters: that is, in effect, for al men's appetites, and marts for al men's purposes, that be any way greeved with the state, or affect novelties." (Bilson. *The True Difference betweene Christian Subjection and unchristian Rebellion.* 110.) "And for the further vexation of the priests, this author proceedeth in his third chapter, to bring them into the highest degree of contempt and hatred: he endeavoureth to bring them into contempt, by telling his reader, that they went over sea, some of them *poore serving-men, other souldiers, other wanderers in the worlde;* good stuffe to make priests of

---

whom Catholikes are to reverence, and at whose feet princes are to kneele. And although our Saviour made choice of his apostles out of the meaner sort of men, to give us to understand that it was their function which was honourable in them, yet these words in this place, might for divers respects have bene spared. First, for that if any such be among them, it is litle for the Jesuits credit, who procure them to take orders. Secondly, because these who are named to have bene the authors of the bookes against which this *Apologie* is written, and seeme by this discourse to be here girded at, have some of them left more to betake themselves to that calling, then all our English Jesuits have done: others are so abundantly provided-for out of their owne patrimonies, as they do maintaine divers others of their friends: others, (if al their worshipfull friends should have failed them,) were so well placed in the universities of England, as they needed not to come to any such bare estate as to become *poore serving-men, souldiers, or wanderers*." (*A Reply to a notorious Libell*, &c. 143.) It is obvious that the majority of those who went over to the foreign seminaries, must have taken this desperate step, either from the restlessness of youth, or from difficult circumstances. But, of course, no hint of this kind was to be expected from any Romish quarter, unless under the pressure of some feud. Persons, accordingly, says, "Albeit divers of them" (the English who went abroad) "were of that kindred and parentage, and so qualified also in themselves, that they might have lived both wealthfully, and at their ease, yf they would have followed the world, and present course of times; yet they made choise rather to fall into manifold daungers, imprisonments, and even death itselfe, then to forsake the truth of the Cath. Religion, or forbeare to communicate the same to others." (*Three Conversions*. Lond. 1603. i. 266.) In another place of this volume, he speaks completely like one who wished to recommend the foreign seminaries, and owed a resentful grudge to the universities at home. "I doubt much, whether England, yf it had continued Catholike, had ever enjoyed such excellent education for their youthe, as by reason of this tribulation, God hath given them abroad in forraine nations."—271.

possible that he should not have been something of an adventurer, building upon such speculations. Hence his enemies naturally painted him as little else than a crafty, ravenous animal of prey[1]. Nor were they likely to think his means less worldly than his aims. However spiritual might be the character claimed for reconcilements to Popery, those who disapproved and dreaded them, necessarily looked only to the probability of their abuse, as political weapons. Habitual confession, always debasing and pernicious, corruptive alike of priest and people, became a most suspicious engine, under Elizabeth, with confessors imported from the Continent[2]. Hence contemporaries ever branded it as cousin-german to treason, and even if this view were occasionally pushed beyond equitable bounds, there was always, undoubtedly, considerable justice in it. None could speak of the proscribed priests as merely liable to infection from extravagant ultramontane doctrines, little known out of books, and long obsolete among practical men. Their acknowledged head was under the actual assumption of a hostile political position. The popes, whose reigns were nearly commensurate with hers, successively excommunicated Elizabeth. Had the term only meant, a solemn declaration that she was cut off from the Roman Church, their thunder might have passed for nothing more than idle vapouring, and senseless impertinence. But Elizabeth was pronounced an illegitimate usurper, to be deposed, if possible. Nay,

---

[1] "Romanistæ lupi sunt, inhiant prædæ, et ovibus insidiantur, timete: vulpes sunt, et esuriunt, capite aut cavete: vultures sunt, cadaver expectant, providete."—HUMPHREY. *Jesuitismi Pars Secunda.* Ep. Pref.

[2] "But when about the twentieth year of her reign, she had discovered in the king of Spain an intention to invade her dominions, and that a principal point of the plot was to prepare a party within the realm that might adhere to the foreigner; and that the seminaries began to blossom, and to send forth daily priests, who should by vow taken at shrift, reconcile her subjects from their obedience; yea, and bind many of them to attempt against her majesty's sacred person; and that by the poison they spread, the humours of most Papists were altered, and that they were no more Papists in custom, but Papists in treasonable faction: then were there new laws made for the punishment of such as should submit themselves to reconcilements, or renunciations of obedience. For it is to be understood, that this manner of reconcilement in confession, is of the same nature and operation that the bull itself was of, with this only difference, that whereas the bull assoiled the subjects from their obedience at once, the other doth it one by one. And therefore, it is both more secret, and more insinuative into the conscience, being joined with no less matter than an absolution from mortal sin. And because it was a treason carried in the clouds, and in wonderful secresy, and seldom came to light; and that there was no presumption thereof so great as the recusants to come to divine service, because it was set down by their decrees, that to come to church before reconcilement, was to live in schism; but to come to church after reconcilement, was absolutely heretical and damnable; therefore, there were added new laws, containing a punishment pecuniary against the recusants, not to enforce consciences, but to enfeeble those of whom it rested

indifferent and ambiguous, whether they were reconciled or no. —It appeareth by the records of the confession of the said Ballard, and sundry other priests, that all priests at that time generally were made acquainted with the invasion then intended, and afterwards put in act; and had received instructions not only to move an expectation in the people of a change, but also to take their vows and promises in shrift to adhere to the foreigner." (BACON. *Observations on a Libel.* Works. iii. 74, 75.) "It appeared by divers secret letters, that the design of Spain was for some years before the invasion attempted, to prepare a party in this kingdom, to adhere to the foreigner at his coming. And they bragged that they doubted not so to abuse and lay asleep the queen and council of England, as to have any fear of the party of Papists here; for that they knew, they said, the state would but cast the eye, and look about to see whether there were any eminent head of that party, under whom it might unite itself, and finding none worth the thinking on, the state would rest secure, and take no apprehension: whereas they meant, they said, to take a course to deal with the people, and particulars, by reconcilements, and confessions, and secret promises, and cared not for any head of party. And this was the true reason, why after that the seminaries began to blossom, and to make missions into England, which was about the three and twentieth year of Queen Elizabeth, at what time also was the first suspicion of the Spanish invasion, then, and not before, grew the sharp and severe laws to be made against the Papists."—*Of a war with Spain. Ibid.* 511.

more: two of these enemies to her throne, had striven to shake it, by the appliances of ordinary warfare. Both had advanced money, and one troops besides. A third had contributed superstitious aids to Philip's highly formidable *Armada*, and pledged himself to the more substantial assistance of an important subsidy. One of the least concessions that Elizabeth's ministers could require from agents, avowedly connected with such hostile foreigners, was a manly disclaimer of their odious pretensions. Nor could any complain with justice, of severity within reasonable bounds, who were known to come from places where such principles were maintained, and who refused to repudiate all participation in them. It may seem a needless aggravation of the severity to which these unfortunate persons were subjected, that interrogatories upon their judgment of pontifical politics, were generally tendered to them. But this really was mercy. Had the detected reconciler been willing to renounce the antichristian sentences that insulted his country, and menaced his sovereign, the forfeited life would have been immediately redeemed.

While the kingdom was pervaded by known importers of such dangerous doctrines, and under constant apprehension of the effect which they might give to Spanish hostility, a merciful consideration of the teachers was hardly to be expected. Many of these, too, became additionally suspicious from the Jesuitic profession. Even a free toleration of Romanism, requires none for the religious combinations engendered by it. Then the Jesuits had avowedly been instituted as a counterpoise to the Reformation. They were notoriously trained and draughted by skilful superiors; they merged individual responsibility, in the capacious, elastic conscience of a community; their machinery was necessarily very much at the command of the most powerful and bigoted of Romish sovereigns. A new class of agents like this, could not appear upon the stage, without augmenting the uneasiness of Elizabeth's cabinet. Nor was Jesuitic agency ever such as to allay the fears and exasperation of Protestants. It was always essentially popish. Some persons partial to the belief of Rome, were unfriendly to her secular pretensions: but Loyola's compact band knew nothing of any such distinctions. It might send into England, with a strong executive, specious instructions to steer clear of politics. Ireland, ready for rebellion, was to receive simultaneously consignments of a very different character. The constant appearance of Jesuitism, during Elizabeth's reign, was on the side of high papal pretensions. Whenever moderation seemed winning its way among Romanists, Jesuitic influence stood in the gap, and old feelings quickly re-appeared in all their former intensity. No blending ever stood better than the coarse energy of Persons[1], and the plausible cleverness of Campion. A foundation was laid which resisted very severe assaults within the citadel, and derided them from without. But this, however creditable to the workmen, was galling to the assailants, and power, in the sixteenth century, would hear a call in it for unrelaxing severity.

Passion was also enlisted, on both sides, against a calm and merciful exercise of reason, by an uninterrupted series of mutual aggressions. The northern rebellion was to have been aided from the Netherlands; Westmoreland, with other rebels, were harboured and pensioned by Spain; some of such English subjects landed in Ireland, both as religious incendiaries, and as combatants. Philip's patronage of all these treasons laid him open to the cupidity of Elizabeth's more daring subjects. His American mines were the envy of Europe. Why not intercept a treasure, so unworthily employed, and so justly forfeited by unsleeping, treacherous hostility? Thus Drake was protected in buccaneering, and angry recrimination destroyed every semblance of good understanding between the courts of England and Spain[1]. Complaints were likewise made of violence undergone by Englishmen in Spain, on account of religion. Some unfortunate subject of the queen discovered his Protestantism; perhaps, offensively. He might reasonably have been sent out of the country: the Inquisition seized him, and he was often cruelly burnt alive[1]. Nothing, indeed, was more unfavourable to the growth of tolerant opinions, than the operations of that infamous tribunal. While it exercised a revolting power of sending to the stake such as denied the ability of Romish priests to call down Christ corporeally from heaven, Protestants could not see the severity of their own dealings with popery. An English execution of some unhappy Jesuit, or Seminarist, with all its horrid butchery, was immediately contrasted with death by fire, with no preliminary strangulation to render it unfelt, or at least, mitigate its agonies[2]. Complaints of

---

[1] Moore attributes to Persons, "virtus, industria, zelus, rerum experientia publicarum." (*Hist. Miss. Angl. Soc. Jes.* 229.) That famous Jesuit died in the English college, at Rome, April 15, 1610. (BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* iii. 426.) There had been a talk, in 1596, of making him a cardinal, to succeed Allen, as ecclesiastical director of the English Romanists, and when he was dying, the pope sent him the indulgences usually granted to cardinals, at such a time.

---

[1] "As in the year, 1569, when the rebellion in the north part of England broke forth; who but the duke of Alva, then the king's lieutenant in the Low Countries, and Don Guerres of Espes, then his ambassador lieger here, were discovered to be the chief instruments and practisers: having complotted with the duke of Norfolk, at the same time, as was proved at the same duke's condemnation, that an army of twenty thousand men should land at Harwich, in aid of that party, which the said duke had made within the realm, and the said duke having spent and employed one hundred and fifty thousand crowns in that preparation? Not contented thus to have consorted and assisted her majesty's rebels in England, he procured a rebellion in Ireland, arming and sending thither, in the year 1579, an arch-rebel of that country, James Fitz-Morice, which before was fled. And truly to speak, the whole course of molestation which her majesty hath received in that realm by the rising and keeping-on of the Irish, hath been nourished and fomented from Spain; but afterward most apparently, in the year 1580, he invaded the same Ireland with Spanish forces, under an Italian colonel, by name San Josepho, being but the forerunners of a greater power, which by treaty between him and the pope should have followed, but that by the speedy defeat of those former, they were discouraged to pursue the action: which invasion was proved to be done by the king's own orders, both by the letters of Secretary Escovedo, and of Guerres to the king; and also by divers other letters, wherein the particular conferences were set down concerning this enterprise between Cardinal Riario, the pope's legate, and the king's deputy in Spain, touching the general, the number of men, the contribution of money, and the manner of the prosecuting of the action, and by

---

the confession of some of the chiefest of those that were taken prisoners at the fort: which act being an act of apparent hostility, added unto all the injuries aforesaid, and accompanied with a continual receit, comfort, and countenance, by audiences, pensions and employments, which he gave to traitors and fugitives, both English and Irish, as Westmoreland, Paget, Englefield, Baltinglass, and numbers of others, did sufficiently justify and warrant that pursuit of revenge, which, either in the spoil of Carthagena and San Domingo, in the Indies, by Mr. Drake, or in the undertaking the protection of the Low Countries, when the Earl of Leicester was sent over, afterwards followed." —BACON. *Observations on a Libel.* Works. iii. 89.

[1] It seems to have been denied, that Englishmen, suffering in Spain, for religion, had given any unprovoked offence in the country. "Her subjects trading into Spain, have been many of them burned, some cast into the galleys, others have died in prison, without any other crimes committed, but upon quarrels picked upon them for their religion here at home."—*Ib.* 88.

[2] "Speaking of the persecuting of the Catholics, he still mentioneth bowelings and consuming men's entrails by fire; as if this were a torture newly devised; wherein he doth cautelously and maliciously suppress, that the law and custom of this land from all antiquity, hath ordained that punishment in case of treason, and permitteth no other. And a punishment surely it is, though of great terror, yet by reason of the quick despatch-

fines incurred by recusancy, were met by mention of the total confiscation that ruined victims convicted of heresy under Queen Mary[1].

Nor, again, were Elizabeth's ministers able to see the full importance of Romanism, even as a system merely religious. Having supplanted an influence long vested in a number of ancient and wealthy houses, they naturally viewed papal partialities, general among the nobility and gentry[2], as little else than the festering discontent of blighted ambition. Their liability to such an impression was augmented by the looseness with which they had seen Romish opinions professed. It was impossible ever to overlook the queen's earlier years, when popery seemed all but extinct. After this abeyance had been terminated by politics, the heads of families often appeared rather with a sullen leaning to old prepossessions, than any profound affection for them. They would not be branded as regular recusants. They came to church, at least occasionally[3]. The fine for absence might be their excuse, or

---

ing, of less torment far than either the wheel, or forcipation, yea than simple burning." (BACON. *Observations on a Libel.* Works. iii. 98.) Bartoli says that Englishmen invidiously made the Spanish Inquisition more cruel than it really was. "I tormenti dell' Inquisitione di Spagna, de' quali (per renderla odiosa) i Protestanti Inglesi facevano tanto romore, ingrandendoli oltre al vero."—187.

[1] "*Quæ major excogitari potest? mulctari in menses singulos viginti librarum mulcta?* Non ita magna ærumna est quin major excogitari potest, nempe, quam nostros homines subire hîc coegistis, regnante Maria, ut bona eorum simul et semel, primo momento omnia abirent in fiscum."—ANDREWES. *Tortura Torti.* 135.

[2] "The principal men of wealth being papists, do give comfort and example to many inferior to follow them. And of consequence their tenants are forced for their livelihood to follow them."—MSS. Burghl. *apud* STRYPE. *Annals.* iii. 625.

[3] "And for matter of religion, albeit they" (the Worcestershire gentry) "are conformable enough, and forward in outward obedience and services; yet I do not perceive any such fervent zele indeed in some of them as I could wish, or that may give me cause to assure

even real reason: either case gave no appearance of invincible prejudice. The ladies of their household were not so pliable. Imported reconcilers had successfully wrought upon them, and church was ruinous pollution[1]. Statesmen would readily account for their pertinacious absence by seclusion from the world, family pride, and even by the mere sensual appeals of Romanism. Its ritual pageantry, and gaudy toys, are captivating to the female and youthful eye. It also gives large indulgence to the human appetite for superstition, and this hold upon all the less masculine classes of intellect, was not forgotten. England was ridiculously described as under the Virgin Mary's especial patronage, and even her dowry; thus people, open to semi-pagan delusions, were abundantly supplied with absurdities to their taste[2]. Sensible

---

myself of their constant affection upon all events and mutations.—For some that be left out of the commission, I am not able to accuse them of recusancy, albeit some of their wives be recusants." —Freake, Bishop of Worcester to the Lord Treasurer. Oct. 6, 1587. MSS. Burghl. *apud* STRYPE. *Ann.* pt. 2. p. 456.

[1] "I know that there is a great danger in many others, who sometimes do come to the church, and yet be papists both in their inward hearts, and in their outward actions and conversations, refusing to receive the communion; and in every thing else as ill as the worst. Of which there be also two sorts. The one goeth to church for saving of the penalties of thirteen score pounds a year, yet his wife and whole family, or most of them, continue resolute recusants, and harbour traitors. The other sort go to the church because they may avoid suspicion of the magistrates the better; and is dispensed withal by some secret dispensation of a delegate, or such a great priest as hath episcopal authority, to the end they may the better, and with the less suspicion, serve the turn of their cause catholic, in receiving and harbouring the most notable priests and intelligencers, in consulting with them and others, in conveying to and from letters and advertisements; or if they be either of great power, wit, knowledge, courage, or desperation (termed *resolution* by Father Parsons) to serve the turn any way, when their day of Jhesus cometh, as the traitors Jesuits call it."—Topcliff, the pursuivant, to the Lord Treasurer, about 1590. *Ib.* iv. 53.

[2] "Sancta Maria, mater Dei, quæ, cum omnibus sanctis, pro omnibus universæ ecclesiæ necessitatibus ad Dominum Deum nos-

men, weaned from an unscriptural belief, inferred naturally from such weaknesses, that a few years of unabated rigour would wear the whole mass of prejudice away. The men of another generation, having no loss of political influence to feed a resentful regret, would resolutely spurn the shewy mummery, religious toys, and idle dreams of their elderly female connections. Thus England would wholly rise above any care for the pope, or for traditional articles of faith, or for a theatrical worship, or for any supernal mediation, unknown to the Bible, and unlikely to be gifted with omniscience.

It is clear that Elizabeth herself reckoned upon time for the full conversion of her people. She appears, as might be expected from an education among those who had imbibed Lutheran opinions, to have set out with an eye to the Confession of Augsburg[1]. This was, probably, rather Parker's view, than the more Calvinistic bias, brought home by the refugees. But neither he, nor his royal mistress, had any thought of employing direct per-

---

trum generaliter orare non desistis; te suppliciter deprecor, ut hoc regnum Angliæ, cujus in te patrocinium speciali quodam modo suscipere voluisti, specialibus conservare, et simul pro ejusdem regni conversione ad unitatem Catholicæ fidei, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, filium tuum, efficaciter exorare digneris. Ut omnes Angli præ cæteris gentibus, ex hoc beata te dicant, et semper ad laudem tuam personent hunc hymnum:

Dos tua, Virgo pia,
Per te est conversa Maria."

Brit. Mus. MSS. Harl. 360.—50. c. f. 99.

[1] In 1559, when the duke of Feria took leave of the queen, on his return to Spain, "She spoke her mind to him freely, but in private, respecting religion: that she wished to establish in the realm something like the Confession of Augsburg: that she did not differ much in opinion from the Catholics, that she believed the real presence in the sacrament, did not find fault with more than three or four things in the mass, and expected to be saved as well as the bishop of Rome. *Que in muy poco deferia ella de nos otros: porque creia que Dios estaba en el sacramento de la eucaristia, e que de la missa le discontaban solo tres o cuatro cosas: que ella pensaba salvarse tan bien como el obispo de Roma.*"—LINGARD. new ed. vii. 267. note.

secution. They seemed confident of eventual success, from occasional displays of a determination to prohibit any external religious profession unauthorized by law. All semblance of injustice in this restraint, was considered out of the question, provided that there was no interference with private opinion. If tests were not forced upon men, as they might have been under the queen's father, and as they were habitually by the Spanish Inquisition, spiritual tyranny was thought sufficiently avoided[1]

The council was, undoubtedly, hostile to Popery, both from theological antipathy, and fear of a reaction. Elizabeth's ministers held places which Romanists enjoyed under her sister. The chief advantages of birth and opulence were still in Romish families: hence, many hopelessly excluded from employment, or the council-board, were highly welcome as courtiers, and complaints of Papists in royal favour, were continually heard[1]. Habits of private friendship in the sovereign were thus a guarantee against unprovoked attacks upon the Romish body. Such wanton injustice also clashed with ministerial exigencies. The cabinet was very far from a mere puppet of an unrelenting high-church influence. Around Elizabeth's council-board sate very able men, generally leaning towards Puritanism. Her two great personal favourites, Leicester and Essex, were avowed patrons of Nonconformity. Nor do these persons generally appear to have sided with Geneva from abstract conviction alone, liable to ebbs and flows of intensity. Their thoughts were necessarily often fixed on gain. They were aspiring men, more or less needy: incessantly met by incongruity of ways and means. Human nature, placed as they were, habitually revels in golden visions of a magnificent old age, and a splendidly-seated posterity. Several families, raised within memory from comparative insignificance, to great hereditary importance and profusion, were pregnant instances of hopes, even inordinately gratified, by means of ecclesiastical pillage. Only let seculars find prizes for insatiate cupidity, as regulars had, under the queen's father, and her ministers might suffer imagination to take its fill. To whet an appetite for the spoil, facilities were even provided, in the act which allowed exchanges of episcopal lands for impropriate tithes and tenths of benefices. The indiscriminate proscription of bishoprics and dignities, advocated successfully as a religious duty, would bring, however, completely, Henry's halcyon days to shine at court again. Puritanical friends out of doors directly tempted ministers with a prospect so inspiring. The low-church party often spoke, indeed, of property, once devoted to religious uses, as inalienable for any other. Hence even impropriate rectories and abbey lands might be reclaimed from their present sacrilegious maintenance of pride and waste[1]. Ancient piety, however mistaken, had really provided in them a fund for the best of purposes. The scanty livings of pains-taking pastors might be augmented, ruling elders pensioned, who could not otherwise give up their time to the church, pious widows kept in readiness for services within their power[1]. At other times, however, such claims upon religion's ancient patrimony could be overlooked. Consistories would never stud all England without political support. Influential men, therefore, were to be tempted by ecclesiastical plunder. Their party could occasionally tell them, that a lofty hierarchy would be well despoiled in favour of themselves. Thus Walsingham, one of the most disinterested of Elizabeth's councillors, yet notoriously poor, was reminded of a ready way to opulence in the pillage of prelacy[2]. It is unlikely that men so linked

---

[1] "I find her majesty's proceedings generally to have been grounded upon two principles: the one, That consciences are not to be forced, but to be won and reduced by the force of truth, by the aid of time, and the use of all good means of instruction or persuasion: the other, That causes of conscience, when they exceed their bounds, and prove to be matter of faction, lose their nature; and that sovereign princes ought distinctly to punish the practice or contempt, though coloured with the pretences of conscience and religion.

"According to these two principles, her majesty, at her coming to the crown, utterly disliking of the tyranny of the Church of Rome, which had used by terror and rigour to seek commandment over men's faiths and consciences; although as a prince of great wisdom and magnanimity, she suffered but the exercise of one religion, yet her proceedings towards the Papists were with great lenity, expecting the good effects which time might work in them. And therefore, her majesty revived not the laws made in 28 and 35 of her father's reign, whereby the oath of supremacy might have been offered at the king's pleasure to any subject, though he kept his conscience never so modestly to himself; and the refusal to take the same oath, without farther circumstance, was made treason: but contrariwise, her majesty, not liking to make windows into men's hearts and secret thoughts, except the abundance of them did overflow into overt and express acts and affirmations, tempered her law so, as it restraineth only manifest disobedience, in impugning and impeaching advisedly and ambitiously her majesty's supreme power, and maintaining and extolling a foreign jurisdiction. And as for the oath, it was altered by her majesty into a more grateful form; the harshness of the name, and appellation of supreme head was removed; and the penalty of the refusal thereof turned into a disablement to take any promotion, or to exercise any charge; and yet that with a liberty of being revested therein, if any man shall accept thereof during his life."—Bacon. *Observations on a Libel.* Works. iii. 73.

---

[1] "As soon was the Papist favoured, as the true Protestant." —Archbishop Parker to the Lord Treasurer. STRYPE. *Parker.* ii. 120.

---

[1] Sutcliffe uses the existing appropriation of monastic property as an argument against confiscation of the episcopal. "If any man think that the spoile of the church should come into the princes hands, he abuseth himselfe. The spoiles of other places do teach us what would fall out: yea, our owne experience may herein sufficiently instruct us. For albeit in the overthrow of abbeys the prince had some share: yet are not now the princes of this land able to maintaine that force that in time past they were, when great nombers both of horsemen and footmen were maintained at the charge of religious houses; the revenues whereof are now wholly employed, and yet scarce able percase to buy some one meane gentlewoman a verdugal: so leudly are they spent, and so great is the pride and waste of men. The reason of it is this, that what they spent then in mainteining of men, the same is now spent in velvets, silks, and glittering coats. Suppose then that the church goods should come to spoyle, do you thinke they would be better spent? It should seeme, no: for all is now spent in surfet and excesse, that in time past was spent in mainteining of men. And I knowe, where, in certaine manors taken from bishops, thousands of men were mainteined, the revenues of all which do not now buy peticoates for my mistres, the owner's wife, and her maydens, and not a man of all their tenants scarce able to do her Majesty service at his owne charge, they are so fined and skinned." (*An Answere to certaine calumnious Petitions*, &c. 32.) It is by no means unlikely that the recent pillage of monasteries weakened public desire for a similar course with other ecclesiastical property. People could not wish to see any more of these wholesale augmentations to the resources of a few haughty and luxurious families, which had crept into court favour.

---

[1] To these charges, Bancroft says that the *Holy Discipline* added another, namely for maintaining the wives and families of deceased pastors.—*Survey*. 184.

[2] "Few of her council imitated the noble disinterestedness of Walsingham, who spent his own estate in her service, and left not sufficient to pay his debts. The documents of that age contain ample proofs of their rapacity. Thus Cecil surrounded his mansion-house at Burleigh with estates once belonging to the see of Peterborough. Thus Hatton built his house in Holborn, on the bishop of Ely's garden." (HALLAM. i. 304.) "But sayth hee, *Who would not thinke the superfluities of bishop's living better bestowed upon such a man, as Sir Francis Walsingham, that right honourable chancellour, and benefactor of the church and country, then upon any bishop?* Wherein hee doeth wrong to the memory of that good knight, and in needlesse discourse, bringeth his name in question. To his supposall I answere, that there be very wise men, that thinke the livings of bishops better as they are, and I thinke hee would so say, if he were alive, and were asked the question: for no man was more desirous then hee of true honour: neyther is any thing more dishonourable then to rise by the spoyles of the church that hee pretendeth to love, nor to take that to himselfe which was given to other uses. Neyther do wee reade of any that hath risen by the spoyles of the church, that hath long prospered, or enjoyed them, nor have the Papistes any thing to object against us more, then sacriledge and spoyle of the church. As for the superfluities of bishops there is order taken. Take four of the best bishops of the England, and there will be found eight knights, every one whereof will farre overmatch

with depressed and struggling supporters, both from principle and selfish views, should have been harder upon the Romanists than they thought circumstances required. It is true that their friends out of doors would have eagerly applauded, if they had resolved upon crushing, by an unsparing persecution, everything denounced as antichristian. But their own good sense and feelings; the queen's equity and early habits; the religious profession of many upon terms of acquaintance with her; were adverse to wanton attacks upon Romish professors. All such persecution was evidently quite inconsistent with lenity towards their own opinions. To this constitution of the council-board, is owing the religious vacillation so remarkable under Elizabeth. Severe laws were no sooner made than a strict observance of them was evaded. Even the national formularies might appear in a garbled state, to gratify either Papist or Puritan. The age, however, made intervals of laxity fearfully treacherous. Abused connivance alternated with vengeance; then farewell to gentle counsels, until apprehension was allayed, and anger spent.

Public opinion bore, in truth, strongly upon government, under Elizabeth. All parties eagerly used the press, and to its influence, hastily obeyed, much of individual hardship may be reasonably traced. Romish publications complained of exclusive persecution, although

---

them in revenues. Take eight bishops next in living to the greatest, and there will be found two hundreth esquires, every one of which shall overpasse them: divers yeomen, clownes, and marchantes doe farre excell the rest. Why then should any envie to men of learning and qualitie the estate and living of knights, esquires, yeomen, and clownes? It will bee sayde, These have it by inheritance: but why should it not, as well be lawfull to have it, and winne it by industrie, as by inheritance?" — SUTCLIFFE. *An Answere to certaine calumnious Petitions*, &c. 85.

Puritanism was equally bold in bearding authority[1]. Protestant Nonconformity suffered next. The council, however favourable generally to low-church views, was shamed into this impartial severity. Much, however, done against Puritanism, has a character strictly defensive: being the deprivation of incumbents who defied or evaded the conditions on which their benefices were holden. It is plain that such cases admit of no solid objection. Their number is an evidence that considerable laxity really prevailed in enforcing the law. Had a call for subscription been regularly enforced upon incumbents at institution, there would never have been so much necessity for subsequent removals. Bancroft, however, assures us that such unauthorized dispensation with established tests was very far from unusual[2]. As might be expected, this lenity was often afterwards abused, and men, whom their superiors had unwarrantably sought to conciliate, became so intractable as to render farther indulgence impossible. It is idle to declaim about persecution in such cases. Elizabeth's ministers, however willing to shield Puritanism, could never deny the necessity of visiting occasionally cases of embarrassing contumacy, by insisting that engagements either should be fulfilled, or appointments forfeited.

Nor could conscientious and comprehensive minds overlook many exceptionable features gradually unfolded by Puritanism. At first, an opinion highly favourable, might be won by loud professions, zealous and ascetic habits. But strong intellects quickly remember that expectation is naturally far more active than possession, and are equally quick in discerning the perfect compatibility of specious morals and an exterior strictly religious, with unchristian pride, malice, and selfishness[1]. The objecting party, too, displayed very suspicious features in widening its claims, and altering its tone. At first, a few dresses and ceremonies, were mildly represented as desecrated by Popery, hence the reverse of edifying: none, therefore, could use them without violating an apostolic injunction. But such arguments rapidly fell into the back ground. Not only were demands fiercely made, that certain externals be cast aside as antichristian; the whole form of church-government must also be changed, and at every hazard, or nothing would be gained[2]. Every parish must have its elective consistory, and each of these meddling, inquisitorial courts was to take impulse and direction from an irresistible system of national organisation. Ministers of a monarchy, themselves, too, candidates for hereditary wealth and distinction, could not overlook the democratic aspect of such a scheme. Its leading patrons, indeed, had been sufficiently explicit in political theories, then of the most startling kind. Idolatrous princes might be driven from their thrones: a nation defrauded of the holy discipline, by the aversion, or procrastination of its rulers, might establish it in defiance of them. Papal pretensions were thus matched with puritanical. Romish partisans, accordingly, range Rome and Geneva side by side, when they want an excuse for ultramontane politics. Even domestically, the *Discipline* revolted wealth[1], and alarmed a cautious ministry. Interference with property was threatened, an encroaching spirit of artful fanaticism might gradually render consistorian tribunals superior to all other[2]. If sectarian bias, or interested hopes, could keep Elizabeth's cabinet from seeing these objections, her ecclesiastical friends would not allow them to be forgotten. Upon her advisers generally, therefore, they must have commanded considerable weight. Two, in her confidence, Leicester and Walsingham, are said eventually to have entertained convictions unfavourable to Puritanism[3].

---

[1] Bacon. *Observations on a Libel.* Works. iii. 61.

[2] *Survey of the Holy Discipline.* 248.

---

[1] "Of this party" (the Puritan) "there were many that were possest with a high degree of *spiritual wickedness;* I mean with an innate restless pride and malice. I do not mean the visible, carnal sins of gluttony, drunkenness, and the like (from which good Lord deliver us) but sins of a higher nature, because they are more unlike God, who is the God of love, and mercy, and order, and peace; and more like the Devil, who is not a glutton, nor can be drunk, and yet is a devil; but I mean those spiritual wickednesses of malice and revenge, and an opposition to government: men that joyed to be the authors of misery, which is properly his work, that is the enemy and disturber of mankind; and thereby greater sinners than the glutton and the drunkard, though some will not believe it."—WALTON. *Life of Hooker.* Keble's ed. i. 43.

[2] Fuller says that the Nonconformists "of this age were divided into two ranks. Some milde and moderate, contended only to enjoy their own conscience: others fierce and fiery, to the disturbance of church and state."—*Ch. Hist.* B. ix. p. 76.

---

[1] "*Quære*, whether it be a matter tolerable, and beseeming wise governors, that clownes and men of occupation, should determine matters of religion, or that ideots should judge of lawe, and governe all matters ecclesiasticall; and by what rule of divinitie it may be surmised, that an ignorant man, being chosen an elder, sholde sodenly be endued with new graces, and as Th. Cartwright, the great disciplinarian patriarke saith, become a new man, as if he were new perboyled in Peleus his tubbe?"—SUTCLIFFE. *An Answere to certain calumnious Petitions*, &c. 188.

[2] "The reasons wherewith ye wolde persuade that Scripture is the only rule to frame all our actions by, are in every respect as effectual for proof that the same is the only law whereby to determine all our civil controversies. And then, what doth let, but that, as those men may have their desire, who frankly broach it already that the work of reformation will never be perfect, till the law of Jesus Christ be received alone; so pleaders and counsellors may bring their books of the common law, and bestow them as the students of curious and needless arts did theirs in the Apostles' time."—HOOKER. Pref. to the *Eccl. Pol.* Keble's ed. i. 225.

[3] "It is well knowen, that both the Earle of Leycester and Sir Francis Walsingham, in their latter times renounced these men, confessing that they had bene greatly abused by their hypocrisie."—SUTCLIFFE. *An Answere to certaine calumnious Petitions*, &c. 178.

Upon the propriety of rejecting disciplinarian oligarchy, posterity has been long agreed. Yet the struggle, which has involved Elizabeth in Protestant complaints of persecution, was almost entirely for its establishment. Liberty of conscience occasioned no dispute; merely the transfer of exclusive rights from one party to another. Those who retained possession, however chargeable with actual intolerance, were, undoubtedly, the more tolerant in principle. Their divinity ranked no religionists among capital offenders, unless they set at nought the first four general councils. This reservation will seem bad enough in modern times; but it was really a great advance towards an enlightened toleration. Romanists would have burnt Protestants for denying transubstantiation, the weakest point, though vital, in Romish belief. Puritans called upon the civil magistrate to punish Romanism capitally, though, perhaps, not at the stake, its adherents being idolaters, whose lives were forfeited by the Mosaic law. If the Brownists had been able to take a more effective position, it is probable, that no milder sentence would have come from them. Their own opinions, on the other hand, hardly met with a more merciful consideration from irritated Puritanism. It is true, that many Romanists, and some Protestants, suffered capitally, under Elizabeth: solely, too, their friends maintain, on account of religion. But no such cause was alleged. Nay, more: it was eagerly disclaimed. Some of these unhappy persons died as traitors, others, as felons. Unquestionably, religion was the principal ingredient in their treasons or felonies, but it made no appearance in an indictment. Positive laws, enacted for offences merely civil, were the sole ostensible causes of condemnation, whatever may be said, and however truly, of the real motive that shed their blood. To them personally, as religion, undeniably, earnt their untimely deaths, it might be very little material, whether any such accusation were brought against them, or no. But a great principle was involved in the specified grounds of their condemnation. However crying might be its injustice, posterity was precluded from pleading it as a precedent for naked religious intolerance. Thus the party espoused by Elizabeth, although chargeable with serious faults in practice, really laid a solid foundation for sounder national feelings. Its views, in fact, were far more enlightened, just, and liberal, than those entertained by any of its opponents.

This also appeared in pure theology, when opportunity came for sufficient and calm consideration. The anti-consistorians, engrossed by Calvin's polity, took little notice of his abstract belief, during many years. But by degrees, externals lost ground, and immediately, Geneva found her divinity under examination. Leading authorities in the Church, undoubtedly, now shewed a disposition to stand by their theological master. Attacks upon him were new, and hitherto time had not been given for inquiry. Whitgift, however, was known as the supporter of Hooker, one of those very moderate Calvinists, whose doctrine was rightly esteemed subversive of the system itself. Nor, although the archbishop was a party to the Lambeth Articles, did he suffer them to narrow the terms of national conformity, at Hampton-court. By this time, Calvin's peculiar theology had attracted sufficient notice, and Romish hostility denounced it as a revolting fruit of the Reformation[1]. It was, unquestionably, very ill suited for obtrusion upon the consciences of a whole people. However unable man's finite understanding may be to see a clear way out of some among the mysterious questions which Calvinism stirs, the manner in which it disposes of them, very often gives offence when broadly stated. Unless Calvinists generally, like every other large body, knew little exactly of their distinctive creed, it would be impossible to retain very many of them as adherents. But ministers of religion are necessarily better informed. Hence the Lambeth Articles must have proved a serious inroad upon the principles of an enlightened liberality, and the Hampton-court conference, however scorned by those who say most against narrow views, really claims their approbation, for declining to impose a test which would have been found highly exclusive. As it is, Calvinists make no difficulty in accepting the terms of Anglican conformity. They even consider the Articles framed by holders of their opinions, and consequently, meant for their views, only not sufficiently full and precise, to exclude opponents. Now this, is an admission, that national terms of conformity were judiciously arranged. Two parties, differing upon some deep matters of speculation, are both willing to take the test, and each maintains, upon grounds satisfactory to itself, that principles of its own, really penned the formulary to which assent is given. It is obvious, that if one had succeeded in excluding the other, tolerant principles would have retrograded, and national rights have been impaired.

---

[1] "But Calvin and his followers (as it is easier to adde than invent) have farre exceeded and over-reached them" (the ancient heretics) "in malice, avouching that God, immediately and directly, is

The religious party, therefore, that prevailed, was

---

the author of al wickednes, which Simon Magus durst not say; yea, the good and the only God worketh and effectuateth this malice, which those ancient heretikes were ashamed to say."—KELLISON. *Survey of the new Religion.* Doway. 1605. p. 241.

really more wise and liberal, than any that opposed it. Rome contemporaneously, with equal arrogance, uncharitableness, and absurdity, stamped a long addition to the Nicene creed, as the Catholic faith, which alone has any promise of salvation. Had her ascendancy been restored, the Marian pyres must soon have blazed again[1]. Her cause, indeed, was intimately linked with Spain, the first and most bigoted of Romish powers, but bond-slave to the Inquisition. Successful consistorian ambition involved an odious tribunal, with intolerant and inquisitorial principles, in every petty neighbourhood. Nor, as it was gradually seen, were all, agreed at one time, theologically, with pontifical democracy, likely to continue so when questions of polity gave place to those of doctrine. Lambeth and Hampton-court shewed how a sectarian oligarchy, with tyrannical intentions, and narrow principles, would have encountered opposition. Such facts fairly under view, make even the religious policy of this prosperous, well-governed, improving, glorious period, seem not unworthy of the civil: which bitterest enemies were driven to hail with unqualified applause[2]. Much, undoubtedly, was indefensible, sometimes highly so. Connivance, alternating with severity, acted with frightful treachery upon discontented men. The blame, however, justly falls between embarrassing, irritating, dangerous acts, and stern, arbitrary times. All parties wanted the entire population, and were equally ready to retain it in subjection, by restraint upon each other. But enlightened civilization gained an invaluable advantage in the ascendancy of that among them, which alone repudiated violence in theory. The establishment and early progress of this great principle have obvious claims upon all who would read men in history. Those, indeed, who consider the reign of Elizabeth, under a superficial affectation of contempt for controversy, must misunderstand its real character. It was essentially religious in its whole course. Foreign politics were wholly coloured by religion. Domestic party had no other pivot. The great families, pining under lost influence, were united by Romish prepossessions. The popular party in the House of Commons was wholly puritanical. In the country, it was chiefly so. Neither aristocratic, nor democratic feeling, had any separate existence: Romanism was an impersonation of the one; generally Puritanism, sometimes Independency, of the other. The queen, and her leading churchmen, steered a middle course. Thus moderate adherents were continually won over, from *ultra* views, and Englishmen generally became that religious community, which still exists, and with every prospect of permanence. Catholic in doctrine, discipline, and liturgy, uncompromising as to personal obligations, majestic, yet simple, in worship, tolerant in principle, judiciously comprehensive in the terms of communion, every year naturally adds tenacity to its hold upon a moral, sober-minded, grateful, and enlightened nation.

---

[1] "Romanistarum leges, quæ non atramento sed sanguine exaratæ, tot in Anglia, Germania, Hispania, Italia, martyres sustulerunt." — Humphrey. *Jesuitismi Pars Secunda.* Epist. Pref.

[2] "Regnaverat Elizabetha annos quatuor supra quadraginta, in ea commodorum omnium redundantia, luxu delitiarum, pacis domesticæ quiete, externorum bellorum eventu prospero, negotiatorum copia et potentia, ducum fortissimorum gloria, clarissimorum senatorum perspicacia, nobilium virorum splendore, privatorum opulentia, ut qui *beatum dixere Populum cui hæc sunt*, hodièque dies illos memorent halcyoneos, in quibus cœlum, terra, maria, convenissent ad Principem in Populo obsequentissimo, et Populum in Principe ornatissima omnibus gratiis cumulandum."—Moore. *Hist. Miss. Angl. Soc. Jes.* 289.

The masculine intellect of England is above a theatric worship, and superstitious toys; auricular confession, and sacramental absolution; mediators, whom neither Scripture warrants, nor reason says, can hear; a belief that Holy Writ is maimed of information, vital to the soul. Nor, again, when free from prejudice and passion, would a generous English mind strip religion of her ancient patrimony, and becoming garb, or degrade her ministry below the liberal professions, or flatter ignorance by delirious hopes of internal illumination, or even by exclusive reference to a narrow section of the sixteenth century. The venerable Church, however, of our fathers, which mounts uninterruptedly to apostolic times, displays no gaudy shew, yet shuns repulsive meanness, feeds no delusive expectation, takes no doubtful ground. Hence, candid, able scrutiny, even of the most searching kind, must rank its preservation among the brightest glories of Elizabeth's auspicious reign.

END OF THE HISTORY.

ON THE NUMBER OF

EXECUTIONS FOR RELIGION,

UNDER QUEEN ELIZABETH.

THE professed principle of this reign was, that none should suffer capitally for religion. It is a profession, however, branded by Nonconformists, both Romish and Protestant, as a false pretence. This is evidently undeniable as to anti-Trinitarians; but all parties of any weight, when discussing persecution, appear to have thought holders of such opinions quite below notice. There were, however, five of these unfortunate persons, cruelly burnt, under Elizabeth: *viz.* John Wielmacker, and Hendrick Ter Woort, in London, 1575: Matthew Hammond, 1579, John Lewis, 1583, and Francis Kett, 1588, all in Norwich.

An equal number of orthodox Protestant Nonconformists was hanged for felony: *viz.* Elias Thacker, and John Coping, at Bury, in Suffolk, in 1583; Henry Barrow, John Greenwood, and John Penry, in 1593, all in London. John Udal, capitally condemned, in 1591, died in prison[1].

---

[1] Sir John Harington, thus mentions another capital conviction of a Protestant. "There was a craftsman at Bath, a recusant Puritan, who, condemning our church, our bishops, our sacraments, our prayers, was condemned himselfe to dye at the Assizes, but at my request, Judge Adderton reprieved him, and he was suffered to remain at Bath upon baile. The Bishop" (Still) "conferred with him, in hope to convert him, and first, my lord alledged for the

To the ten opponents of Popery who actually suffered, are to be added, as it seems, one hundred and eighty of its adherents, who were convicted of high treason. Such, at least, is known to be the case with those among them of whom any particulars are preserved, and it can hardly be otherwise, as to the rest. The first upon the list, is John Felton, hanged, drawn, and quartered, in 1570, for posting the deposing bull upon the door of London House. He was a violent fanatic, unquestionably, and his offence resulted from that cause, but he really seems rather entitled to a place among civil offenders, than religious. In the following year, 1571, John Story was executed, at Tyburn. With his death, commercial vengeance might seem to have had some concern. In the next year, there was no religious execution; but in 1573, Thomas Woodhouse, a Lincolnshire priest, long prisoner in the Fleet, was found guilty of high treason, at Guildhall, June 16, and executed at Tyburn, June 19[1]. In 1577, Cuthbert Mayne was executed, at Launceston. In 1578, Nelson and Sherwood, at Tyburn. There also suffered, in 1581, Campion, and three others. Thus there had been now

---

authority of the Church, St. Augustine: the Shoomaker answered, Austin was but a man: he produced for antiquity of bishops, the fathers of the councell of Nice: he answered, they were also but men, and might erre: Why, then, said the bishop, thou art but a man, and mayest and doest erre. No, sir, saith he, the Spirit beares witnesse to my spirit that I am the child of God. Alasse, saith the bishop, thy blinde spirit will lead thee to the gallowes. If I die, saith he, in the Lord's cause, I shall be a martyr. The bishop, turning to me, stirred as much to pitty as impatience, This man, said he, is not a sheepe strayed from the fold, for such may be brought in againe on the shepheard's shoulders; but this is like a wild buck broken out of a parke, whose pale is throwne downe, that flies the farther off, the more he is hunted. Yet this man that stopt his eares, like the adder, to the charmes of the bishop, was after perswaded by a layman, and grew comfortable."—*Nugæ Antiquæ*. i 143.

[1] Stowe. 676.

ten executions of Romanists: subsequently, every year has one, or more: *viz.*

1582	11	1594	8
1583	4	1595	7
1584	9	1596	2
1585	9	1597	1
1586	10	1598	5
1587	8	1599	1
1588	36	1600	10
1589	7	1601	6
1590	4	1602	6
1591	18	1603	1
1592	1		
1593	6		170[1].

Of these 180 executions, in all, of Romanists, the places, besides London, were Launceston, York, Winchester, Lancaster, Wrexham, Chelmsford, Gloucester, Dorchester, Chard, Stafford, Hounslow, Chichester, Canterbury, Kingston, Ipswich, Derby, Holywell, Oxford, Rochester, Durham, Newcastle, Beaumaris, and Lincoln. By far the greatest number, out of London, took place at York; and it will be observed that 1588, the year of the *Armada*, was much more severe than any other. As the numbers, though supplied by a Romanist, are not disputed by a Protestant opponent, these 180 unfortunate persons must be supposed to have suffered, more or less, on religious accounts: but if their cases were accurately known, probably, the government would appear, in many of them, in something of a better light than in that of a wanton persecutor[2].

---

[1] "A Bead-roll of such traiterous priests, Jesuits, and Popish Recusants, as by I. W. Priest, in his English Martyrologie are by him recorded for martyrs, in this kingdom."—*The Fyerie Tryall of God's Saints.* Lond. 1612.

[2] "The whole number of such priests, Jesuits, and Recusants, as were executed in all the time of Queene Elizabeth's Raigne, being 44 yeares and 4 moneths, according to the martyrologist's owne account (as he falsely pretends for

Other accounts make the Romish victims more numerous[1], and loose dissenting declamation would cast an air of sanguinary Protestant persecution over this reign, charging it also wholly upon the hierarchy[2]. The real truth, however, seems to be (and it is bad enough) that 190 persons suffered capitally for offences, connected with religion, under Elizabeth: five, only, being actually condemned as religious offenders. The other five Protestants were convicted of publishing seditious libels. The Romanists were evidently open to a charge of treason, although it might be pushed too far, as, undoubtedly, were the severities to which it led. The laws under which their priests suffered, did not, however, affect such of that body as were ordained under Queen Mary[3], only parties from abroad, connected with foreigners, in open

---

religion) amounts to but 180." (*Fyerie Tryall of God's Saints.*) Protestants naturally enough estimated this by Mary's carnage in a much shorter time.

[1] "The total number of these sufferers is calculated by Dodd, in his *Church History*, at 191. Further inquiries by Dr. Milner, increase their number to 204. Fifteen of these, he says, were condemned for denying the queen's spiritual supremacy; 126 for the exercise of priestly functions; and the others for being reconciled to the catholic faith, or aiding or assisting priests."—BUTLER. *Hist. Mem.* i. 178.

[2] "The Protestant Church of England is deeply steeped in the blood of the saints." (PRICE. i. 472.) This passage occurs in an attack upon Archbishop Whitgift, charging him with atrocious cruelty, but chiefly talking of unnamed persons, killed in prison. It is easy to throw such imputations, and to assume that all the supposed victims were "saints," to whose deaths the archbishop was a party. Most readers, however, would know something about names, and numbers, and charges, and parties to whom committals can be traced.

[3] "These lawes against which you complaine, drewe not in your priests which were made in Queene Maries time, though they were catholique priests, and exercised their priestly function, and though they had better meanes to raise a partie in England, because they were acquainted with the state, and knew where the seeds of that religion remained: but in that catholique religion of which they were priests, they found not this article of tumult, and sedition, and withdrawing subjects from their obedience."—DONNE. *Pseudo-martyr.* Lond. 1610. p. 161.

hostility with England. Even these appear to have had universally the power of redeeming their lives by a patriotic, manly, christianlike disavowal of the odious principles by which hostile aliens sought to undermine the English government[1]. Their obstinate adherence to such anti-social delusions was greatly to be lamented, because many of these unhappy men were highly respectable in their general conduct, and all must have come over with an enviable spirit of self-devotion. Still, none could have brought home any sound views of religious obligation[2]. Men really thus happy were not likely to scruple about an explicit renunciation of the execrable papal politics. They were, in fact, chiefly, if not entirely, poor men, seeking for a living among discontented members of the nobility and gentry of England: hence alike willing to feed the ill humours of their patrons, and to indulge in sanguine visions raised by revolutionary hopes within themselves. The dangers faced, were analogous to those encountered in the battle-field. A soldier enters it fully alive to them, but anticipating escape, and promotion. His bosom, indeed, may glow with genuine patriotism: still, without a large alloy of humbler motives, men rarely brave the chance of war.

---

[1] "When some priests in England were examined what they would thinke of the oath of allegiance, if the pope were to pronounce that it were to be held *De Fide*, that he might depose princes, they desired to be spared, because they could not pronounce *De futuris contingentibus*." (DONNE. *Pseudo-martyr*. 191.) "Refusall of the oath is an implied affirming of some doctrine contrarie to it."—*Ibid*. 206.

[2] Of course, their own party thought otherwise. Dr. Donne, accordingly, says, "I have seene, at some executions of trayterous priests, some bystanders, leaving all old saints, pray to him whose body lay there dead."—*Ibid*. 222.

POPES

DURING THE ELIZABETHAN PERIOD.

Name and Surname.	Official Designation.	Accession.	Death.
John Peter Carrafa	Paul IV.	May 23, 1555	Aug. 18, 1559.
John Angelo de' Medici	Pius IV.[1]	Dec. 28, 1559	Dec. 9, 1565.
Michael Ghislieri	Pius V.	Jan. 8, 1566	May 1, 1572.
Hugh Buoncompagno	Gregory XIII.[2]	May 13, 1572	Ap. 10, 1585.
Felix Peretti	Sixtus V.[3]	Ap. 24, 1585	Aug. 27, 1590.

[1] It is this pope who added thirteen articles to the Nicene creed (the last a sweeping approbation of "the sacred canons, and œcumenical councils, especially the council of Trent"), and stamped all the mass, as "the true Catholic faith, without which no one can be safe."

[2] "Gregory XIII., of the age of seventy years, by surname Buoncompagno, born in Bolonia of the meanest state of the people, his father a shoemaker by occupation; of no great learning, nor understanding, busy rather in practice, than desirous of wars, and that rather to further the advancement of his son and his house, a respect highly regarded of all the popes, than of any inclination of nature, the which, yet in these years, abhorreth not his secret pleasures." (Bacon. *Of the State of Europe.* Works. iii. 1.) "We are indebted to this pope for the new calendar: for it was in his pontificate, and by his order, that the calendar was rectified, and the *New Style*, as they call it, introduced. It first took place in the month of October, 1582, and was immediately received in all Catholic countries, but rejected by the Protestants, choosing rather to continue in their error, than to be rectified by the pope. It has been adopted, within these few years, by the British Parliament. I find nothing laid to the charge of this pope, but his having had a natural son, before he was cardinal, John Buoncompagno, whom he created cardinal as soon as he was preferred to the popedom, and his raising him, as well as the rest of his relations, to the first honours both in the state and the church."—Bower. *Hist. of the Popes.* Lond. 1766. vii. 466. 468.

[3] "In 1588, there sat in the see of Rome, a fierce, thundering friar, that would set all at six and seven, or at six and five, if you allude to his name: and though he would after have turned his teeth upon Spain, yet he was taken order with, before it came to that." (Bacon. *Of a War with Spain.* Works. iii. 529.) "Pope Sixtus V. also, that he might not seem wanting to the cause" (when the *Armada* was to sail) "sending Cardinal Allen, an Englishman, into the Low Countries, renewed the bulls declaratory of Pius V. and Gregory XIII. excommunicated the Queen, dethroned her, absolved her subjects from all allegiance, and published his Croisado in print, as it were against Turks and Infidels, wherein, out of the treasury of the Church, he granted plenary indulgences to all that gave their help." (Cambden. 543.) "Sixtus entertained no small jealousy of the overgrown power of Philip of Spain, and was, therefore, glad to keep

Name and Surname.	Official Designation.	Accession.	Death.
John Baptist Castagna -	Urban VII.[4] -	Sept 15, 1590	Sept. 27, 1590.
Nicholas Sfondrati -	Gregory XIV.[5]	Dec. 5, 1590	Oct. 15, 1591.
John Antony Facchinetti	Innocent IX.[6]	Oct. 29, 1591	Dec. 30, 1591.
Hippolytus Aldobrandini	Clement VIII.[7]	Jan. 13, 1592	Mar. 3, 1605.

on good terms with Queen Elizabeth, declining under various pretences, to lend any assistance to Philip against her, besides his useless anathemas, which he could not well refuse, and which he knew would do the Queen very little hurt. Sixtus had, from the beginning of his pontificate, formed a design of conquering the kingdom of Naples, and uniting it to the dominions of the Church. This design he resolved to carry into execution upon the first news he received of the total defeat of the Spanish *Armada*, in 1588, and ordered with that view 25,000 men to be raised with all possible expedition. But in the mean time, death put an end to all his designs."—BOWER. vii. 471.

[4] A Roman by birth, but of a Genoese family. He died on the twelfth day after his election.—*Ibid.* 474.

[5] A Milanese, and consequently, born a subject of Spain. To gratify Philip, his native sovereign, he excommunicated Henry IV., and gave all the assistance in his power, to that monarch's enemies. In France, his bull was declared scandalous, and contrary to the rights of the Gallican Church.—*Ibid.*

[6] A native of Bologna, crowned Nov. 12.

[7] "Clement VIII. is represented by the contemporary writers as a man of uncommon abilities; of great discretion and prudence. It was at the pressing instances of this pope, that the restoration of the Jesuits, who had been banished France upon the murder of Henry III. was brought about in 1603, by his successor, Henry IV."—BOWER. vii. 476.

ENGLISH PRELACY

DURING THE ELIZABETHAN PERIOD.

Canterbury.

Name and Surname.	Consecration, or Confirmation.	Death, or Translation.
Matthew Parker	Dec. 17, 1559	May 17, 1575.
Edmund Grindal	Feb. 15, 1576	July 6, 1583.
John Whitgift	Sept. 23, 1583	Feb. 29, 1604.

York.

Thomas Young	Jan. 27, 1561	June 26, 1568.
Edmund Grindal	May 22, 1570	Canterbury.
Edwin Sandys	Mar. 8, 1577	Aug. 8, 1588.
John Piers[1]	Feb. 19, 1589	Sept. 28, 1594.
Matthew Hutton[2]	Mar. 24, 1595	Jan. 15, 1605.

London.

Edmund Grindal	Dec. 21, 1559	York.
Edwin Sandys	July 1, 1570	York.
John Aylmer[3]	Mar. 24, 1576	June 3, 1594.

---

[1] This prelate's name was also written, though rarely, Pearse. He had been fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, afterwards dean of Christchurch. When consecrated bishop of Rochester, he was made royal almoner. In 1588, being then bishop of Salisbury, he preached the thanksgiving sermon, Nov. 4, before the queen, at St. Paul's, on the destruction of the Spanish *Armada.* He died at Bishopsthorpe.—Godwin. *de Præsul.* 711. Strype. *Whitgift.* i. 549. *Annals.* iii. pt. 2, p. 28.

[2] A native of Lancashire, first fellow of Trinity College, afterwards master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, also successively Margaret and Regius professor of divinity there. He was highly eminent for his learning, especially in the Fathers. Like most of his contemporaries, his theological principles were decidedly Calvinistic, and he expressed a strong approval of the Lambeth Articles. Predestination he pronounced a "comfortable doctrine," and he considered that "God had used Augustin as a special instrument to set it forth."—Godwin. *de Præsul.* 711. Strype. *Whitgift.* ii. 312.

[3] Formerly tutor to Lady Jane Grey. Soon after Mary's accession he fled, and resided, first at Strasburg, afterwards at Zurich. He was rather

Name and Surname.		Consecration, or Confirmation.		Death, or Translation.
Richard Fletcher[4]	-	Jan. 4, 1595	-	June 15, 1596.
Richard Bancroft[5]	-	May 8, 1597	-	Canterbury.

---

under-sized, and seems to have occasionally shewn a constitutional infirmity of temper. He had, however, taken his part so decidedly against Puritanism, and thus become so obnoxious to its adherents, that much has been said to place him in an unfavourable light. Among the offences, as contemporaries considered it, of which he was really guilty, must be placed a spirit of accumulation. Long acquaintance with an unmarried clergy made people think it criminal in a bishop to raise his descendants above mediocrity. Aylmer, however, was willing to brave the calumnious envy of observers, rather than to lose the prospect of leaving his portrait to be pointed-out in a country seat, as founder of the family. Men who had no such opportunities, or hated new candidates for their own elevation, or thirsted for episcopal plunder, took their revenge by reflections upon the bishop of London's covetousness. Fulham had been famous for its elms, and Aylmer lopped them, though it seems not excessively. His name suggested a pun. He was *Elm-mar*. Constant uneasiness in the see of London, made him apply for a translation to Ely. Had he gone thither, it must have been on hard conditions, and it was said he would not be that *Ely-mar*. As these witticisms had some protection in the bishop's undeniable habits, the zeal with which he had preached against ecclesiastical superfluities, in early life, was invidiously remembered. He died at Fulham, aged seventy-three, and was buried in St. Paul's Cathedral.—Harington. *Nugæ Antiquæ*. i. 20—22. Strype. *Aylmer*. 112.

[4] Bishop Fletcher was a polished, handsome Kentish man, formerly fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. While dean of Peterborough, and queen's chaplain, he had the unenviable office of addressing Mary of Scotland, when brought out to suffer, and he made use of the opportunity to attack that ill-fated princess upon her religious opinions. He successively filled the sees of Bristol, Worcester, and London. Soon after his preferment to the last, he fell grievously under the queen's displeasure. She had more than the usual degree of prejudice against the marriage of clergymen, and would never allow a new validity to the acts of her brother's first and third years, annulling all laws, statutes, and canons against it, or to the statute of his fifth and sixth years, which formally legitimated clerical families, and marriage-settlements. Mary's repeal of these acts continued unreversed. Hence, for the protection of their families, ecclesiastics were compelled, under Elizabeth, to procure acts of legitimacy, or license from the ordinary and two justices of the peace, on contracting marriage. Bishop Fletcher, however, had not only lived as a married man, but losing his wife, found another in a gay, well-connected widow. Elizabeth could not brook this. He was thus what Romanists call a *digamist*, a term denoting one inadmissible into holy orders among them, although the second wife should be dead. The queen seems to have thought some such view of clerical matrimony capable of extension into the reformed church of England, and by her command, Fletcher was suspended. His disgrace, however, did not last long, even so far as the queen's own countenance went, for she subsequently honoured him with a visit. Her objections were probably found incapable of legal enforcement. Soon afterwards, the offending prelate suddenly died.—Harington. i. 26. 31, 32. Strype. *Parker*. ii. 461. *Whitgift*. ii. 216. Sutcliffe. *An Answere to certaine calumnious Petitions*, &c. 129.

[5] Born at Farnworth, in Lancashire, in September, 1544, of a gentleman's family. His mother was Mary, daughter of John Curwyn, and niece of Hugh Curwyn, bishop of Oxford. He took his bachelor's degree, in arts, at

DURHAM.

Name and Surname.	Consecration, or Confirmation.	Death, or Translation.
James Pilkington[6]	Mar. 2, 1561	Jan. 23, 1575.
Richard Barnes[7]	May 9, 1577	Aug. 24, 1587.
Matthew Hutton	July 27, 1589	York.
Tobias Matthew[8]	Ap. 7, 1595	York.

WINCHESTER.

Robert Horne	Feb. 16, 1561	June 1, 1580.
John Watson	Sept. 18, 1580	Jan. 23, 1584.

Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1566; his master's, at Jesus, in 1570. He was college-tutor to Lord Cromwell, who complained of him as austere and sharp, but subsequently admitted his competence, and regretted that he had not stayed under him longer. The spirit and ability of his controversial pieces against Puritanism, rendered him highly obnoxious to its adherents, who branded him with Popery. He had shown his activity, by obtaining the first clue to the *Mar-prelate* press, and his boldness, by preaching at Bury against Puritanism, when the place and neighbourhood seemed wholly prostrate before it. The desired innovations had already begun there, "*without staying for the magistrate*, as the term then was." He had been successively chaplain to Archbishop Whitgift, and to the Lord Chancellor Hatton, and it was by the former's interest, and Lord Burghley's aid, that he was made bishop of London. On Whitgift's death, he was advanced to the see of Canterbury, being, as the late queen would have desired, a single man. He died of the stone, Nov. 2, 1610.—Additions to GODWIN. *de Præsul.* 157. 193. HARINGTON. i. 12. STRYPE. *Whitgift.* ii. 386.

[6] Born at Rivington, in Lancashire, of an ancient gentleman's family. After his return from exile, under Mary, he was made master of St. John's College, Cambridge, where he had received his academical education. He founded and endowed a free-school at his native place.—Additions to GODWIN. *de Præsul.* 756. STRYPE. *Cheke.* 5.

[7] Of a respectable family at Bolde, near Warrington, in Lancashire, a branch of the baronial family of Bernes. He was originally of Brazenose College, Oxford, where he took his master's degree, but he proceeded bachelor of divinity at Cambridge. In 1561, he was made chancellor of York, and in 1567, he was nominated by the archbishop of that see to the queen, with another, for the office of suffragan, under the act of 26 Henry VIII. The choice falling upon him, he was consecrated suffragan of Nottingham. When made bishop of Carlisle, he had license to hold his chancellorship of York *in commendam.* During his occupancy of Durham, he was very active, especially against Romanism, and thus became highly obnoxious in many quarters. He died at fifty-five.—Additions to GODWIN. *de Præsul.* 757. STRYPE. *Parker.* i. 477. *Annals.* ii. pt. 2, p. 112. LE NEVE. 318.

[8] Born at Bristol, of reputable parentage, and educated academically at St. John's College, Oxford. In 1576, he became dean of Christchurch, a relation having induced him to take orders, against the original intent of his parents, who seem to have been disaffected to the established religion. He proved a brilliant preacher, and an accomplished divine. One of his passports to distinction was a Latin sermon, eventually printed, preached against Campion. In 1584, he was removed from Christchurch to the deanery of

Name and Surname.	Consecration, or Confirmation.	Death, or Translation.
Thomas Cowper[9]	Mar. 23, 1584	Ap. 29, 1594.
William Wickham[10]	Feb. 22, 1595	June 12, 1595.
William Day	Jan. 25, 1596	Sept. 20, 1596.
Thomas Bilson[11]	May 13, 1597	June 18, 1616.
	St. Asaph.	
Richard Davies	Jan. 21, 1560.	St. David's.
Thomas Davies	May 26, 1561	Sept. 1573.
William Hughes	Dec. 13, 1573	Nov. 18, 1600.
William Morgan	Sept. 17, 1601	Sept. 10, 1604.
	Bangor.	
Rowland Merick	Dec. 21, 1559	Sept. 27, 1565.
Nicholas Robinson	Oct. 20, 1566	Feb. 13, 1584.
Hugh Bellot	Jan. 25, 1585.	Chester.
Richard Vaughan	Jan. 25, 1595	Chester.
Henry Rowlands	Nov. 12, 1598	July 6, 1616.

Durham, rather against the queen's good will. She thought him too young, and objected besides to his marriage. He died archbishop of York, March 29, 1628.—HARINGTON. *Nugæ Antiquæ.* i. 226. STRYPE. *Annals.* i. 514. LE NEVE. 231.

[9] Born in Oxford, of obscure parentage. He was of Magdalen College there, and, at one time, master of the school attached to it. His fitness for this appointment was shown in a new and improved edition of Sir T. Eliot's Latin Dictionary, dedicated to Edward VI. He was one of the learned Oxford men, who charged Bishop Cheney with unsound doctrine. By his *Admonition to the People of England*, he gave deadly offence to the Puritans, and his name suggested their punning title, *More Work for the Cooper.* His domestic peace was undermined by a wife who grossly misconducted herself. —Additions to GODWIN. *de Præsul.* 239. STRYPE. *Memorials.* ii. pt. 2, p. 121. HARINGTON. *Nugæ Antiquæ.* i. 72.

[10] Born at Enfield, in Middlesex. He had been fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and subsequently was vice-provost of Eton, in which situation his kindness and attention to the school, in the master's absence, gained him great respect. A short time before his death, he preached before the queen and parliament, eloquently reproving the prevailing disposition to pillage episcopacy. He admitted an excess of wealth in former years, fully justifying curtailment, but he denounced a continuance of the actual system, as threatening speedy ruin to prelacy and cathedrals. Elizabeth bore the rebuke with that patience, which a strong mind fairly censured, generally shows.—HARINGTON. *Nugæ Antiquæ.* i. 75. Additions to GODWIN. *de Præsul.* 240.

[11] Born at Winchester, and educated in the two St. Mary Winton Colleges. His family was of German origin. He was first schoolmaster in Winchester College, and afterwards warden. By his *True Difference between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion*, his *Perpetual Government of Christ's Church*, and publications upon Christ's descent into hell, he established a high character among contemporary controversialists.

BATH AND WELLS.

Name and Surname.	Consecration, or Confirmation.	Death, Translation, or Resignation.
Gilbert Berkeley	Mar. 24, 1560	Nov. 2, 1581.
Thomas Godwin	Sept. 13, 1584	Dec. 19, 1590.
John Still[12]	Feb. 11, 1592	Feb. 26, 1607.

BRISTOL.

Richard Cheney[13]	Ap. 29, 1562	Ap. 25, 1579.
John Bullingham	Sept. 3, 1581	—— 1589[14].
Richard Fletcher	Dec. 14, 1589	Worcester.

CHICHESTER.

William Barlow	Dec. 20, 1559	Aug. 13, 1568.
Richard Curteis	May 21, 1570	Aug. 1582.
Thomas Bickley	Jan. 30, 1585	Ap. 30, 1596.
Anthony Watson[15]	Aug. 15, 1596	Sept. 10, 1605.

ELY.

Richard Cox[16]	Dec. 21, 1559	July 22, 1581.
Martin Heton	Feb. 3, 1599	July 14, 1609.

---

[12] Dr. Still was a native of Lincolnshire, who had been fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. Subsequently, he was master of Trinity, and Margaret professor. He had also been chaplain to Archbishop Parker, rector of Hadleigh, in Suffolk, and archdeacon of Sudbury. Like his predecessor, Bishop Thomas Godwin, he was recommended to the queen by the want of a wife, both being widowers, and therefore approaching the state which she thought fittest for a clergyman, that of a bachelor. Both prelates, however, offended her by marrying again, and some of the courtiers were on the alert to profit by her displeasure. Bishop Godwin immediately had urgent applications for a hundred years' lease of the manor of Banwell, and at last he could only make his peace by leasing Wilscombe for ninety-nine years. Bishop Still seems to have escaped with little worse than some royal jests upon his marriage, Wickham's bold sermon against the pillage of bishoprics being thought to have operated in their favour. — Additions to GODWIN. *de Præsul.*; 390. HARINGTON. *Nugæ Antiquæ.* 130. 132. 140.

[13] He held Bristol *in commendam* with Gloucester.

[14] This was a resignation. Bishop Bullingham, like his predecessor, Cheney, had hitherto holden Bristol *in commendam* with Gloucester.

[15] Formerly fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, afterwards dean of Bristol. When the queen became offended with Bishop Fletcher of London, she removed him from the office of royal almoner, and appointed Bishop Watson in his room.—GODWIN. *de Præsul.* 514.

[16] After the death of Cox, who had been schoolmaster of Eton, and subse-

EXETER.

Name and Surname.	Consecration, or Confirmation.	Death, or Translation.
William Alley	July 14, 1560	Ap. 16, 1570.
William Bradbridge	Mar. 18, 1571	June 27, 1578.
John Woolton[17]	Aug. 2, 1579	Mar. 13, 1593.
Gervase Babington	Mar. 11, 1594	Worcester.
William Cotton	Nov. 12, 1598	Aug. 26, 1621.

GLOUCESTER.

Richard Cheney	Ap. 19, 1562	Ap. 25, 1579.
John Bullingham	Sept. 3, 1581	May 20, 1598.
Godfrey Goldsborough	Nov. 12, 1598	May 26, 1604.

HEREFORD.

John Scory	Dec. 20, 1559	June 26, 1585.
Herbert Westfaling	Jan. 30, 1586	Mar. 1, 1601.
Robert Bennet	Feb. 20, 1602	Oct. 25, 1617.

LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY.

Thomas Bentham[18]	Mar. 24, 1560	Feb. 21, 1579.
William Overton	Sept. 18, 1580	Ap. 9, 1603.

---

quently tutor to Edward VI., the see of Ely was kept vacant for nearly twenty years. Elizabeth could not bear to relinquish her hold upon its ample endowment, though she professed, at one time, to retain it in hand chiefly for the sustenance of Anthony, pretender to the throne of Portugal, who was hence jocularly known as bishop of Ely.

[17] Bishop Woolton, or Wolton, was born at Whalley, in Lancashire, of a respectable father, and a sister of Dean Nowell's. With his uncle, he fled abroad in 1555, and remained away during the Marian persecution. He was the first warden of Manchester College, after its re-foundation by Elizabeth, in 1578, it being represented as dissolved by an act of her first year. It had formerly undergone this fate under Edward, and was restored by Mary. It was originally founded by Thomas, lord De la Ware, in 1422, for a warden and eight fellows. Elizabeth's re-foundation was for a warden and four fellows. Wolton had been appointed canon residentiary of Exeter, in the beginning of the queen's reign, and he remained in that city, with only one clergyman besides, intent upon visiting the sick and dying, during a frightful pestilence. He wrote several religious tracts, now forgotten. He died suddenly of asthma in his sixtieth year.—MS. extract from Bishop Grindal's Register. CHURTON'S *Life of Nowell.* 257.

[18] Born of a respectable family, at Sherborn, in Yorkshire. He was of Magdalen College, Oxford, and lived at Basle, during part of Mary's reign, having returned privately before its termination. He was an excellent Hebrew scholar.—Additions to GODWIN. *de Præsul.* 325.

Lincoln.

Name and Surname.	Consecration, or Confirmation.	Death, or Translation.
Nicholas Bullingham	Jan. 21, 1560	Worcester.
Thomas Cowper	Feb. 24, 1571	Winchester.
William Wickham	Dec. 6, 1584	Winchester.
William Chaderton	May 24, 1595	Ap. 11, 1608.

Norwich.

John Parkhurst	Sept. 1, 1560	Feb. 2, 1574.
Edmund Freake	Nov. 14, 1575	Worcester.
Edmund Scambler	Jan. 15, 1585	May 7, 1594.
William Redman	Jan. 12, 1595	Sept. 25, 1602.
John Jegon	Feb. 20, 1603	Mar. 13, 1617.

Oxford.

John Underhill[19]	Dec. 24, 1589	May, 1592.

Peterborough.

Edmund Scambler[20]	Feb. 16, 1561	Norwich.
Richard Howland	Mar. 16, 1585	June, 1600.
Thomas Dove[21]	Ap. 26, 1601	Aug. 13, 1630.

Rochester.

Edmund Guest	Mar. 24, 1560	Salisbury.
Edmund Freake	Mar. 9, 1572	Norwich.
John Piers	Ap. 15, 1576	Salisbury.
John Young	Mar. 16, 1578	Ap. 10, 1605.

---

[19] The see of Oxford had been vacant more than twenty years, when Bishop Underhill, one of the queen's chaplains, a native of Oxford, and rector of Lincoln College there, was appointed. After his death, in great discontent and poverty, (the first fruits yet remaining quite undischarged,) the see was kept vacant until the accession of James. — Godwin. *de Præsul.* 545, and Additions. Harington. *Nugæ Antiquæ.* i. 173.

[20] Born at Gressingham, in Lancashire; educated at Peter House, Cambridge; chaplain to Archbishop Parker. He is chronicled as an intolerable dilapidator of both his bishoprics.—Godwin. *de Præsul.* and Additions. 441, 559.

[21] Of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, chaplain to the queen.—Godwin. *de Præsul.* 559.

Salisbury.

Name and Surname.	Consecration, or Confirmation.	Death, or Translation.
John Jewel	Jan. 21, 1560	Sept. 23, 1571.
Edmund Guest	Mar. 1572	Feb. 28, 1576.
John Piers	Dec. 2, 1577	York.
John Coldwell	Dec. 26, 1591	Oct. 14, 1596.
Henry Cotton	Nov. 12, 1598	May 7, 1615.

Worcester.

Edwin Sandys	Dec. 21, 1559	London.
Nicholas Bullingham	Jan. 26, 1571	Ap. 18, 1576.
John Whitgift	Ap. 21, 1577	Canterbury.
Edmund Freake	Dec. 5, 1584	Mar. 21, 1590.
Richard Fletcher	Feb. 10, 1593	London.
Thomas Bilson	June 13, 1596	Winchester.
Gervase Babington[22]	Oct. 4, 1597	May 27, 1610.

Carlisle.

John Best	Mar. 2, 1561	May 22, 1570.
Richard Barnes	July 13, 1570	Durham.
John Mey	Sept. 29, 1577	Feb. 15, 1598.
Henry Robinson[23]	July 23, 1598	June 19, 1616.

Chester.

William Downham	May 4, 1561	Dec. 3, 1577.
William Chaderton	Nov. 8, 1579	Lincoln.
Hugh Bellot	Sept. 25, 1595	June, 1596.
Richard Vaughan	Aug. 12, 1597	London.

St. David's.

Thomas Young	Jan. 21, 1560	York.
Richard Davies	May 21, 1561	Nov. 7, 1581.

---

[22] Of gentlemanly origin, and formerly fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.—Harington. *Nugæ Antiquæ.* i. 149. Godwin. *de Præsul.* 472.

[23] He was a native of Carlisle, and had been provost of Queen's College, Oxford.

Name and Surname.	Consecration, or Confirmation.	Death, or Translation.
Marmaduke Middleton	Oct. 1582	Nov. 1593.
Anthony Rudd[24]	June 9, 1594	Mar. 1614.

LLANDAFF.

Name and Surname.	Consecration, or Confirmation.	Death, or Translation.
Hugh Jones	May 5, 1566	Nov. 15, 1574.
William Blethin	Ap. 17, 1575	Oct. 1590.
Gervase Babington	Aug. 29, 1591	Exeter.
William Morgan[25]	July 20, 1595	St. Asaph.
Francis Godwin[26]	Nov. 22, 1601	Hereford.

[24] A Yorkshireman, formerly fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, afterwards dean of Gloucester.—GODWIN. *de Præsul.* 587.

[25] Born at Gwibernant, in Carnarvonshire, and educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. He is worthy of immortal honour as the translator of Scripture into Welsh.—*Ibid.* and Additions. 613.

[26] Son of Thomas Godwin, bishop of Bath and Wells; born at Harrington, in Northamptonshire, and educated at Christchurch, Oxford. He published in 1601, his *Catalogue of the English Bishops,* being then sub-dean of Exeter. The queen was so pleased with the work, that she gave him immediately the see of Llandaff, though barely two months vacant. The temptation to retain it was, indeed, small; Bishop Kitchen, the last Romish incumbent, having stripped it unmercifully. Hence, when Babington held it, he called himself bishop of *Aff,* the land being gone.

Bishop Godwin published a second edition of his Catalogue, in 1614, and a third, in Latin, in 1616. He was translated to Hereford, Nov. 18, 1617, and he died at Whitbourn, near that city, April 29, 1633. He says that he was born, when Elizabeth had been four years on the throne.—*Ibid.* 613. 496. HARINGTON. *Nugæ Antiquæ.* i. 192.

INDEX.

Abbey lands inalienably devoted to religion, 379
Abbot, Archbishop, testimony respecting Persons, 266
Abdy, Patrick, arrested, 322
Absence from church, penalties against, 12. increased, 283
Absolution, treatment of, at Hampton-court, 534. 549. papal, made high treason, 134
Ackworth answers Sanders, 209
Admonition to the Parliament, 163. proclamation against, 193
Admonition, Allen's, 346
Advertisements, the, 43
Agnus Dei, 134
Alan Cope, a name assumed by Harpsfield, 476
Albert, Archduke, the, married to the *Infanta* Isabella, 499
Aldobrandini, Hippolytus: see Clement VIII.
Algrind, 218
Allen, William, Cardinal, particulars of, 92. argues against attendance at church, 93. applies for Jesuits to undertake the English mission, 262. attacks the English government for persecution, 307. sends priests to Stanley, 351. offensive publications, 355. cited as an authority for assassination, 331, an answer to his politics thought incumbent on English Romanists, 339. regarded as their chief, 489
Allen, the Irish Jesuit, 279. slain, 281
Alva, duke of, sends Vitelli into England, 110
Ambrose, St., cited for ruling elders, 179
Anabaptists persecuted, 213
Anderson, C. J., intemperance of, 484
Andrewes, Dean, at Hampton-court, 531
Angus, Archibald Douglas, earl of, 84
Anjou, Francis de Valois, duke of, suitor to Elizabeth, 235
Anointing, Queen Mary's, considered unlawful, 36
Anthony, claimant of the Portuguese throne, 433. 608
Apocrypha, lessons from, denounced, 139. defended at Hampton-court, 544
Archpriest, appointment of the, 506
Arden, Edward, 310
Armada, the Spanish, 355
Arran, James Hamilton, earl of, descent, 84
Arthington, 399

Article, Twentieth, contested clause in the, 152. omission in, paralleled, 222. Twenty-ninth, omission of, 156

Articles, Thirty-nine, passed in convocation, 6. long without parliamentary sanction, 148. obtain it, 149. bill for their partial rejection, 162

Articles, the Fifteen, 222

Articuli pro Clero, royal assent to, 488

Arundel, Henry Fitz-Alan, earl of, commanded to court, 112. Philip Howard, earl of, arrest and particulars of, 347. said to have celebrated mass for the success of the *Armada*, 359

Asser, published by Archbishop Parker, 209

Association, the, 322

Assurance, doctrine of, thought insufficiently maintained in the Articles, 538. evils of the doctrine, 541

Attrition, doctrine of, 90

Augsburg, Confession of, apprehensions of its adoption by England, 16

Austria, Don John of, seeks to marry Mary Queen of Scots, 254

Aylmer, John, bishop of London, particulars of, 603. commits for vending the *Admonition to the Parliament*, 228. convenes the city clergy upon Stubbe's *Gaping Gulf*, 241. displeased with translations of Campion's *Ten Reasons*, 289. arrests Cartwright, 386. writes to the benchers of the Temple in favour of Travers, 443. surprised at Whitgift's retinue, 559

Babington, Anthony, conspires, 343. arranges a correspondence with the queen of Scots, *Ib.* connected with Savage, *Ib.* finds accomplices among his friends, 344. tried, *Ib.* executed, 345

Babington, Bishop, particulars of, 610. present at Hampton-court, 531

Bacon, Sir Nicholas, speech of, 161

Bagnal, Sir Henry, defeat of, 496

Bagshaw, an opponent of Persons, 265. has the bells rung to insult him, 268

Ballard, treason of, 342, confesses that the priests were privy to the intended Spanish invasion, 573

Balsham, Familists discovered at, 214

Balthasar, Widow, dance at the house of, 405

Bancroft, Richard (successively bishop of London, and archbishop of Canterbury), sermon at St. Paul's Cross, 377. complained of, as the first to develop high church principles, 448. protects the discontented Romish seculars, 502. apprehensive of James's accession, 517. at Hampton-court, 531. nominated for the second day's conference, 537. out of temper, 539. argues against Reynolds, 541. objects to a new translation of Scripture, 542. offensively compliments the king, 551. particulars of, 604

Barlow, Dean, at Hampton-court, 531

Barnes, Bishop, particulars of, 605

Baron, Peter, opposes Calvinism, 454. preaches an anti-Calvinistic *clerum*, 471. shielded by Archbishop Whitgift, 472. dies, 473

Baronius embarrassed by Matthew Paris, 209

Barrett, W., preaches against Calvinism, 464

Barrington, Bishop, munificence of, 213

Barrow, Henry, early history of, 415. tried, 421. executed, 422

Barrowism, nature of, 418. 419. 424. 425. 428. extent of, 420

Baptism by women denounced, 139. treatment of, at Hampton-court, 534. 549. original rubric for, 535

Bartholomew massacre, 249. reprobated among English Romanists, 251

Bellarmine, Cardinal, acknowledges the learning of Whitaker, 290

Benedictines, alleged antiquity of, in England, 490

Benefices competent for their incumbents, small number of, 501

Bentham, Bishop, particulars of, 608

Berga, Peter, accomplice of Felton, 125

Bernold, 243

Beza, political principles of, 37. letter of, insisting upon *pure discipline*, 164

Bible, Genevan, 207. Breeches, *Ib.* Bishops', 208. Genevan objected-to by James I., 546. a new translation desirable, *Ib.* ordered, 551

Bilson, Bishop, preaches upon our Lord's descent into hell, 477. at Hampton-court, 531. 543. particulars of, 606

Binius embarrassed by Matthew Paris, 209

Birchet, Peter, outrage of, 195

Bishop, active in procuring signatures to the protestation of the thirteen priests, yet afterwards made vicar apostolic, 505

Blackwater, battle of the, 496

Blackwell, George, appointed archpriest, 506

Blake, letter of James to, 552

Bolton castle, 99

Boner, Bishop, molested by Bishop Horne, 71. denies his episcopal character, 72. relieved from the consequences of refusing the oath of supremacy, *Ib.*

Book of Discipline, publication of, 382

Borgarucci, Julius, 438

Bosgrave, renounces the deposing power, 305. attends church, 568

Bothwell, James Hepburn, earl of, 87

Bound, Dr., originates the Sabbatarian controversy, 459

Bowing at the name of Jesus objected-to, 139

Boy of Burton, the, 478

Briant, equivocation of, 304. executed, 307

Bridges, Dean, at Hampton-court, 531

Bromley, Sir Henry, displeases the queen by a motion about the succession, 412

Broughton, Hugh, controverts the prevailing doctrine as to our Lord's descent into hell, 476. taunts Archbishop Whitgift with apprehensions of the Scottish succession, 517

Browne, Robert, founder of the Brownists, 228

Brownism thought to be almost extinct, 415. revived by Greenwood and Barrow, 416

Brownists, principles of, 229. expatriation of, 454

Bucer, views of, as to the habits, 30

Bullinger, testimony of, to the general satisfaction given by Edward's reformation, 16. letter of, in favour of vestural conformity, 67. unites with Gualter in a letter to the earl of Bedford, soliciting his interference for the dissentients, *Ib.*

Bulls, procurement and importation of, made high treason, 134

Buoncompagno, James, 278. 601

Burghley, William Cecil, Lord, probably procured the Twenty-ninth to be omitted in an edition of the Articles, 157. patronises Travers, 443. examines Lopez, 535. gains estates from the see of Peterborough, 584

Burial-service, objection to, 132

Burton, accusation of the bishops by, 153

Cadwallader, Roger, one of the thirteen protesting priests, subsequently executed, 505

Calendar, Gregorian, 601

Calvin, no party to the ordination of Whitingham, 34. his political principles, 36. evaded, *Ib.* careful to prevent Whitingham's ordination from being used as a precedent, 233. compared with Beza, 448. doctrine of, respecting the descent of Christ into hell, 476. uses the oath *ex officio*, 405. authorizes confirmation, 533. his theology denounced by Romanists in certain points, 590

Calvinistic works, growing unpopularity of, 565

Cambridge, preaching licenses, 58. pulpit personalities at, 147

Campion, Edmund, chosen for the English mission, 261. orders for his apprehension, 263. early history, 269. commissioned for England, 273. arrives, 274. in London, 275. thinks of a challenge, 277. attends a meeting of the missionaries in London, 285. answers the royal proclamation, 286. goes into the country, *Ib.* his *Ten Reasons*, 287. meets Persons at Uxbridge, 290. taken, 292. tortured, 294. 300. disputes, 297. pledges himself to inviolable secresy to his friends, 300. tried, 301. equivocates as to the deposing power, 304. 305. executed, 306. characters of him, 308. Coke's judgment that his act was treason, 310. different spellings of his name, *Ib.* his *Ten Reasons*, the alleged cause of Lord Arundel's conversion, 347

Canons of 1571, 158

Cap, square, not objected-to at Hampton-court, 539

Carter, William, 313

Cartwright, Thomas, particulars of, 141. controverts Whitgift's answer to the *Admonition to the Parliament*, 175. lightly esteemed by Jewel, 177. greatly offended, 178. yet so esteemed by Whitaker, *Ib.* named as author of the *Admonition to the Parliament*, 163. extravagantly commended, 177. order for his arrest, 198. eluded, *Ib.* answered by Archbishop Parker's means, 209. approves of Dering's prophecy, that Parker would be the last archbishop of Canterbury, 218. acknowledges the kindness of Archbishop Whitgift, 369. disclaims *Mar-Prelate*, 372. arrested, 386. final provision for, *Ib.* intemperance of, 388. release of, 401. death, 402. 558. alleged regret for the troubles that he had caused, *Ib.* confers with Barrow, 421. prevented by Whitgift from publishing against the Rhemish Testament, 558

Catechism, Calvin's, used at Northampton, 159. Trentine, publication of, 19. liable to mislead, 90. objections to the authorized, at Hampton-court, 538. additions ordered, 551

Catechisms, inconvenient number of, in Scotland, 546

Cathari, 52. 53

Catharine de' Medici, takes exception at the Trentine decrees, 6. mortifies Mary Queen of Scots, 80

Cathedral dignitaries, pronounced unscriptural, 128. service, denounced, 139

Catholicity, test of, according to Vincent of Lerins, 7

Cawdrey, 395

Cecil, Robert (afterwards earl of Salisbury), examines Lopez, 435. extorts a second confession from Squire, 493. obnoxious to James, 523. makes overtures to him, 524. flatters him at Hampton-court, 548

Ceremonies, bill passed by the Commons for the abolition of, 162

Chadderton, Mr., at Hampton-court, 531

Chaderton, Dr. William, resignation of, 144

Charke, William, opinions of, 189. expelled from Cambridge, 190. replies to Campion's letter, 286. disputes with him, 299

Charles IX., accession, 82. conduct as to the Bartholomew massacre, 248

Chateaubriand, researches of, as to the Bartholomew massacre, 249

Cheney, Richard, bishop of Gloucester, ordained Campion, 270. particulars of him, 271

Christmas and Easter kept at Geneva, 517

Churching of women, denounced, 139. objected-to, at Hampton-court, 539

Clark answers Sanders, 209

Clarke, William, conspiracy of, 523. arrested, 525. executed, *Ib.* not respected as a martyr, 528

Clement, James, assassinates Henry III., 429

Clement VIII., particulars of, 602. admires Hooker, 451. interferes in Ireland, 495. sends a phœnix plume to O'Neil, 497. endeavours to influence the English succession, 498

Clergy, little influence of, at Elizabeth's accession, 566. divided as to the propriety of attending church, *Ib.*

Codreto, an alleged authority for regicide, 332

Coke, Sir Edward, judgment of, as to subscription, 151. tracks the royal supremacy through every reign, 397. states the illegality of papal pretensions in the House of Commons, 410. figure of, at Squire's trial, 493

Cole, R., exhibited as an example of clerical conformity, 47
Colleton, falsely charged on Campion's trial, 302
Commendone, papal legate, privately gains the king of Poland, 5
Como, Cardinal, letter of, to Parry, 333
Concealers, nature of the attacks by, 487
Concealment, commissions of, 437. abolished, 440
Conciliatory nature of Elizabeth's religious policy, 9
Conferences, Puritanical, 188
Confession, Romish, danger of, 257. evils of, 572. 573
Confirmation, qualified censure of, 139. treatment of, at Hampton-court, 533. 541. 543. 550
Confiscation, undergone by Protestants, under Mary, 578
Consecrations, episcopal, act for confirming, 72
Copes, to be worn in cathedrals, 44. reprobated, 50
Coping, John, hanged for a seditious libel, 420
Coppinger, 398
Coranus: see Corro, Anthony de
Corona oblationis, 243
Corro, Anthony de, 457
Cosin, Richard, defends the oath *ex officio*, 404
Coverdale, Bishop, particulars of, 73. one of the translators of the Geneva Bible, 207
Cowper, Bishop, publishes an *Admonition to the People of England*, 374. particulars of him, 606
Cox, Bishop, assists Parker in arguing for the retention of crosses, 15. particulars of him, 607
Cranmer, Archbishop, ignorance of, as to eldership, an infirmity, 193
Cranmer, George, pupil to Hooker, 442
Creighton, arrest of, 322. condemns regicide, 331
Crompton, opinion of, against the oath *ex officio*, 403
Cross, sign of, denounced, 139. admitted antiquity of, 539
Crucifix, retention of, in the royal chapel, 14. thoughts of retaining it generally, 15
Cullen, Patrick, 436
Cummin, Faithful, 78
Cup, sacramental, temporary allowance of, to Romanists, in the Austrian states, 11

Dacre, George, Lord, death of, 118
Dacre, Leonard, rising of, 118. defeated, 119
Dalton, argues for the oath *ex officio*, 411
Darnley, Henry Stuart, Lord, marriage, 83. ancestry, 84. ill conduct, 85. appearance, *Ib.* proclaimed king, *Ib.* murdered, 87.
Darrel, John, delusions of, 478. deprived, 482
Davenport, Mr., puritanical motion of, 375
Davison, William, ruined by transmitting the warrant for executing the queen of Scots, 349

Day, William, disputes with Campion, 297
Degrees, university, denounced, 146
Democratic spirit favourable to Puritanism, 35
Deportation of Romish priests, 340
Deposing bull, Jesuitic explanation of, 263. evasions of, 301. disclaimed by some, 305
Deprivations at the queen's accession, 33
Derby, Henry Stanley, earl of, discovers the *Mar-Prelate* press, 371
Dering, 191. 193. prophecies that Parker would be the last archbishop of Canterbury, 218
Descent into Hell, our Lord's, controversy upon, 476
Diaconate, the, denounced in the *Admonition to the Parliament*, 168
Directory, puritanical, proposed introduction of, into parliament, 555
Disciplinarian controversy, rise of, 137. 144
Discipline, puritanical, nature of, 169. democratic tendency of, 180. date assigned to it, 445. decline of its influence, 454
Disputations, Campion's, 297
Doleman, book under the name of, 432
Douay college, 92. 97
Dove, Bishop, at Hampton-court, 531. particulars of, 609
Drake, buccaneering of, 577
Drury, Robert, one of the thirteen protesting priests, subsequently executed, 505
Dublin, Trinity college, founded, 445
Dudley, Ambrose, earl of Warwick, 49
Durey, John, defends Campion from Whitaker, 289
Durham, outrage to the service books at, 115

Ecclesiastical courts, objections to, in Elizabeth's last parliament, 591
Ecclesiastical Polity, publication of, 441
Edification only to be consulted in regulating church usages, 66
Egerton, Lord Keeper, in commission on the Norwich case, 487
Elders, ruling, office of, 180. pontifical nature of, 181
Eldership, particular, intended by Barrow, 428
Elfric, publications from, by Archbishop Parker, 210
Elizabeth, Queen, refuses the Emperor Ferdinand's application, 10. allowed by Knox to have a special privilege to govern, 35. opposed to the anti-vesturists, 38. charges the bishops to suppress irregularities, 40. refuses to sanction the *Advertisements*, 42. partial to handsome men, 49. insists upon Archbishop Parker's enforcement of conformity, 61. observation upon Darnley, 85. judicious government in her earlier years, 90. denounced by the pope as incapable of sovereignty, 108. removes to Windsor under apprehension of some danger, 110. peremptorily orders the attendance of Norfolk at Windsor, 112. excommunicated by Pius V., 120. thirteenth anniversary of her accession kept with unusual joy, 131. new parliamentary provisions in favour of her title, 131.

visits Cambridge, 142. interferes to suppress Mr. Strickland's motions in the House of Commons, 148. probably desired the omission of the Twenty-ninth, in a printed edition of the Articles, 257. disapproves of the *prophesyings*, 161. quashes parliamentary bills upon ecclesiastical questions, 161. would have had Birchet executed by martial law, 196. irreconcilable to the *prophesyings*, 199. uneasy on account of intelligence falsely given to Archbishop Parker, 201. reproves him for his visitation in the Isle of Wight, 204. highly respected Foxe, 215. again suppresses puritanical movements in the House of Commons, 221. thought preaching too general, 225. suppresses the *prophesyings*, 226. courted by the duke of Anjou, 235. announces her intention to maintain the established religion, 240. complains of dangers to her life, 248. professes to abstain from forcing consciences, 251. alleged to have forfeited Ireland, 279. anxious for Campion's apprehension, on account of Anjou, 290. complains of the necessity of prosecuting Campion and others, 300. orders the discontinuance of torture, 301. thought to be marked for assassination in Martin's *Treatise of Schisme*, 313. informed of projects against her life upon the Continent, 319. retrenches some of the clauses in the bill for legalising the Association, 323. speaks arrogantly upon ecclesiastical affairs, 324. said to be surrounded by dissolute characters, 347. libelled by Allen, 356. refuses to treat the leading Romanists with severity, on the eve of the Spanish invasion, 357. resolute against religious innovation, 366. termed a goddess, 376. rebukes the attacks of Knollys upon bishops, 380. testimony of Arthington to her freedom from common sins, 400. angry that Cartwright should preach without subscription, 402. uses very high language in parliament, 411. displeased with a motion about the succession, 412. regrets the execution of Barrow and Greenwood, 422. indirect testimony of Henry IV. to her chastity, 431. writes to him on his Romish conformity, *Ib.* plots of Lopez and others against her, 433. displeased with the Lambeth Articles, 468. displeased with Baron, 472. thought slightly of, by Clement VIII., 495. compelled to sell some of the crown lands by Irish expenses, 501. her last illness, 507. death, 509. character, 510. above mere obstinacy, 514. highly spoken of by James I., *Ib.* names James I. for her successor, 515. perhaps uneasy by finding her courtiers making overtures to him, *Ib.* pleased with large episcopal retinues, 559. impatient of Archbishop Whitgift's favourable opinion of Essex, 560. 561. inclined to the Confession of Augsburg, 580.

Elliot, George, 291

Ely, bishopric of, long vacancy of, 513. 607

Ely-house, Hatton's attempt upon, 438. 584

Emerson, 262

Englefield, Sir Francis, implicated with Throgmorton, 318

Episcopacy, puritanical attacks upon, 138. Romish petition for, 506
Espionage, Romanists harrassed by, 346
Essex, Robert Devereux, earl of, examines and arrests Fereira, 435. thought well of at one time by Archbishop Whitgift, 560. conveyed, on his arrest, to Lambeth, 561
Estates of the realm, disputes about the term, 393
Exchanges of episcopal revenues, disadvantageous act for, 219. evil of, 513
Excommunication, treatment of, at Hampton-court, 536. objections to its exercise by laymen, 539. bull of, against Elizabeth, not generally approved by English Romanists, 124. posted by Felton, 126. and in Paris, *Ib.*
Execution of Justice, publication of, 309

Family of Love, persecuted, 214
Farnese, Cardinal, proposed husband for Lady Arabella Stuart, 499. 529
Fasts, stated, denounced, 139. placed exclusively on civil grounds, 245
Fausley, puritanical press at, 371
Felonies, severe treatment of, 259
Felton, outrage of, 126. executed, 127. his act disapproved by most English Romanists, *Ib.*
Ferdinand, the emperor, intercedes for the English Romanists, 11. for the sacramental cup, and clerical marriage, *Ib.*
Fereira, Stephen, dà Gama, 433
Feria, duke of, parting conversation of, with Elizabeth, 580
Field, concerned in the *Admonition to the Parliament*, 163. committed, 173. a leading agent, 174
Field, Dr., at Hampton-court, 531
Finch, Sir Moyl, candidate for Kent, 485
Fitz-Gerald, Gerald, 280
Fitz-Maurice, James, 278
Fletcher, Bishop, particulars of, 604
Flowerdew, Serjeant, opinion of, unfavourable to the legality of sacramental wafers, 244
Formularies, printed, falsifications in, 223
Fortescue, Sir John, entrusted with the custody of Morice, 411
Foxe, John, objects to the vestures and subscription, 74. edits the Saxon Gospels, 211. intercedes for the foreign sectaries, 215. an annuitant under the duke of Norfolk's will, 252
France, declines acceptance of the Trentine decrees, 6
Francis II., king of France, 80
Fuentes, Count de, 434
Fugitives, Romish, misconduct of many, 92
Fulke, Dr., disputes with Campion, 299

Galloway, P., representation of the Hampton-court conference, by, 537
Gaping Gulf, the, 236

Garnet, Henry, provincial of the Jesuits, supports Weston, 489. receives briefs concerning the succession, 500

Gauden, Bishop, an editor of Hooker, 446

Geneva, *Platform of Discipline*, established at, 182

Ghislieri, Michael: see Pius V.

Gifford, Dr. William, encourages the regicide projects of Savage, 312

Gilby, Anthony, representation of, as to Knox's principles, 36. concerned in the *Admonition to the Parliament*, 163. also in translating the Geneva Bible, 207. his violence, 227

Gnesna, 5

Goad, Dr., disputes with Campion, 299

Godwin, Francis, bishop of Llandaff, particulars of, 610. Thomas (his father, afterwards dean of Canterbury, and bishop of Bath and Wells, successively), made dean of Christchurch, 54

Golden day, Romish expectation of, 131

Goldwell, Thomas (deprived bishop of St. Asaph), ordained Sanders, 103. was to have returned with Persons and Campion, 263

Goodman, attack of, upon female government, 35. summoned before the High Commission, 159

Gospels, Anglo-Saxon, published by Archbishop Parker, 210

Greenwood, John, a reviver of Brownism, 416. tried, 421. executed, 422. hostile to the anabaptists, 428

Gregory XIII., particulars of, 601. offers thanksgivings for the Paris massacre, 249. desires the Jesuitic mission into England, 262. makes hostile movements upon Ireland, 278. gives an indulgence to Parry, 334

Gregory XIV., particulars of, 602

Grindal, Edmund (successively prelate of London, York, and Canterbury), argues against crosses, 15. opposes the habits, 21. thought decidedly puritanical, 62. collates Coverdale to St. Magnus, 74. has an altercation with a body of Puritans, 76. advises the refusal of Cartwright's degree, 145. throws doubts upon the canons of 1571, 158. particulars of, 218. endeavours to regulate the *prophesyings*, 224. writes to the queen in their favour, 226. declines to act against them, *Ib.* disgraced, 238. death, 367. never a privy-councillor, 563

Guest, Bishop, writes in favour of the habits, 51

Gunpowder first manufactured in England, under Elizabeth, 91

Habits, opposition to, 17. nature of, 28. danger of surrendering them, 38

Hacket, 398

Hall, Hugh, 311

Hammond, Matthew, burning of, 234

Hampton-court conference, 530

Hance, 256. 258

Hanmer replies to Campion's letter, 286

Harding, Thomas, intimate with Allen, 93. particulars of, 101

Harpsfield denounces Calvin's doctrine of our Lord's descent into hell, 476

Harsnet, Samuel (eventually archbishop of York), preaches against Calvinism, 466. patronised by Archbishop Whitgift, *Ib.*

Hartlebury-castle endangered by a commission of concealment, 440

Hartley, William, circulates Campion's *Ten Reasons*, 288

Hatton, Sir Christopher, marked for assassination, 195. charged with contriving the earl of Northumberland's death, 348. built a house on the garden of Ely-house, 584

Hawkins, Sir John, wounded, 195

Heath, Thomas, assumes collusively the character of a Puritan, 78

Hell, Broughton's explanation of the term, 477

Henry II., king of France, 80

Henry III., assassination of, 429

Henry IV., accession, 428. first conformity to Romanism, 429. final conformity, 430. excuses it to Wilkes, *Ib.* bears indirect testimony to the chastity of Elizabeth, 431

Heywood, Jasper, the first English Jesuit that returned to his native country, 262. offensive to Persons, 284. holds a sort of synod, 285

High Commission Court, nature of, 46

Hooker, Richard, particulars of, 442. controversy with Travers, 444. 456. death, 445. modification of the Lambeth Articles, 468. college-pupil to Reynolds, 554. his Calvinism, 563

Horne, Robert, bishop of Winchester, opposes the habits, 24. did not think them a sufficient cause for secession, 38. tenders the oath of supremacy to Boner, 71. who represents his consecration as deficient in legal validity, 72

Host, Romish, date of the modern, 243

House of Commons, disciplinarian care for influence in, 185

Howard, Charles, lord admiral, interferes to save Campion from mutilation before death, 306

Humbert, 243

Humphrey, Dr. Lawrence, opposes the habits, 29. declines conformity, 45. deprived of his professorship, 54. vainly presented to a living, 56. eventually conforms, *Ib.* answers Campion's *Ten Reasons*, 289

Hunsdon, Henry Carey, Lord, defeats Leonard Dacre, 119

Huntingdon, Henry Hastings, earl of, favourable to Whittingham, 231

Hutton, Matthew (eventually archbishop of York), approves Whittingham's ordination, 230. charged with money-lending, 234. particulars of, 603

Ibarra, Stephen, 434

Important Considerations, publication of, 95

Infanta, Isabella, the, movements in favour of, 432. marriage of, 499

Injunction-men, 242

Injunctions, directions of, as to the habits, 27

Innocent III., charged with the introduction of the pyre, as a punishment of heresy, 215

Innocent IX., particulars of, 602
Inquisition, Spanish, English sufferers by, 577
Intention, ministerial, alleged insufficiency of the disclaimer of, in the Thirty-nine Articles, 538
Interrogatories, baptismal, objections to, at Hampton-court, 539
Ireland, Spanish invasion of, in 1601, 501

Jackson, Dr. Thomas, testimony of, as to the *prophesyings*, 224
James I., approves, while in Scotland, of plans to deliver his mother, 319. spoke highly of Elizabeth, 514. named by her, when dying, to succeed, 515. encounters no difficulty in taking the crown, *Ib.* spoke contemptuously of the English church, 517. insulted by the Scottish clergy, 518. gives a favourable answer to Dr. Neville, *Ib.* represented as favourable to the millenary petitioners, 520. severe upon popery, in his way to London, 522. publishes a proclamation against puritanical movements, 529. commits himself to the church party, 532. but desires satisfaction in certain points, 533. assents to baptismal regeneration, 535. said to have played the Puritan, on the first day of the Hampton-court conference, 537. speaks moderately of predestination, 544. decidedly maintains episcopacy, *Ib.* laughs at Dr. Reynolds, *Ib.* objects to the Lambeth Articles, 546. mentions the inconvenient number of Scottish catechisms, *Ib.* objects to the Genevan Bible, *Ib.* says that the Scottish presbytery had usurped the royal supremacy, 548. grossly flattered at Hampton-court, 549. defends the oath *ex officio*, shows considerable coarseness and indiscretion, 552. shows more ability than the Puritans expected, 562
James II., conversion of, ascribed largely to Hooker, 450
Jerome, cited for ruling elders, 179
Jesuits, proclamation against, 281. native, made liable to the penalties of high treason, 324. proclamation against them and their adherents, 502. the utility of the quarrel between them and the seculars asserted at Hampton-court, 543. represent Romish conformity as discreditable to the seculars, 569
Jewel, John, bishop of Salisbury, argues against crosses, 15. seems to have intended resignation, if unsuccessful, *Ib.* opposes the habits, 24. refuses institution to Humphrey, 56. entrusted with a revision of the Articles, 152. death and particulars of him, 153. thought lightly of Cartwright, 177. reported to have died favourable to Romanism, 178
Johnson, Francis, 454
Joscelyn, compiler of the work *De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ*, 208
Judith and Holofernes, 313
Julio, Dr., 438
Justification, doctrine of, treated at Hampton-court, 544

Keswick, mines at, 91
Kett, Francis, burnt at Norwich, 354

King, Dr., at Hampton-court, 531
Kirkby, Luke, 262
Kneeling at the sacrament objected-to, 139
Knewstubbs, Mr., at Hampton-court, 531
Knightly, puritanical family of, 371
Knollys, Sir Francis, a friend to the anti-vesturists, 42. brings in a bill to abolish pluralities, 375. attacks Bancroft's sermon, 380. seconds Morice, the Puritan, 411
Knox, John, attacks female government, 35. arrives in Scotland, 82. expresses disgust at the outrages committed on ecclesiastical buildings, 83. one of the translators of the Geneva Bible, 207. has considerable influence in some towns in the north of England, 224

Lambeth Articles, 467. Hooker's modification of them, 468. suppressed, 476. their insertion in the Thirty-nine, demanded at Hampton-court, 538
Lambeth-house, Leicester's desire of, 437
Langside, battle of, 79
Latimer, the only Marian martyr respected by Penry, 425
L'Aubespine, the French ambassador, implicated in designs against Elizabeth's life, 350
Laud, Archbishop, speech of, on the contested clause in the Twentieth Article, 154
Lauro, Vincent, bishop of Mondovi, fruitless mission of, towards Scotland, 98
Law, common, to be superseded by the *Discipline*, 588
Lawyers, common, contemptuous mention of, 516
Laynez, Diego, 12
Leases, ecclesiastical, restriction upon, 152
Leicester, Robert Dudley, earl of, a friend to the anti-vesturists, 42. advises conformity, 46. account of him, 48. 49. obtained the deanery of Durham for Whittingham, 232. offended by Arden, 310. charged with poisoning Sir N. Throgmorton, 315. exerts himself to prevent Archbishop Whitgift from being a privy-councillor, 563. aims at Lambeth-house, 437. patronises Dr. Julio, 438. said to have renounced the puritanical party at last, 588. libelled by Allen, 356. death, *Ib.*
Lennox, Matthew Stuart, earl of, descent, 84. Margaret, countess of, descent, *Ib.*
Le Quien, erroneous view of, 208
Lesley, bishop of Ross, intrigues for Mary, 109. unsuccessfully interrogated, 112
Lever, summoned before the High Commission, 159. concerned in the *Admonition to the Parliament*, 163
Lewis, John, burnt at Norwich, 354
Liturgy, Genevan, used by Puritans, 158
Livery to retainers, 310

Lollardy identified with Barrowism, 426
London full of enemies to cap and surplice, 37
Longworth, apologises for irregularities in his college, 61
Lopez, Roderic, 433
Lumley, John, Lord, commanded to court, 112
Lutheran party, 15
Lyfford, 291

Machiavellian policy charged upon the government, 157
Mackbray, influence of, in certain towns in the north of England, 224
Manwood, Judge, charge of, against Mayne, 256
Margaret professor, election of, 473
Mar-Prelate, 370
Marriage-service, objection to, 139. ring, a Romish device, 140
Martin, Gregory, Campion's friend, 272. his *Treatise of Schisme*, 313. death, *Ib.*
Martyrs, Marian, no authorities for the Discipline, 184
Mary Queen of Scots, lands in England, 79. her early history, 80. assumes the royal arms of England, 81. returns to Scotland, 82. hardly obtains personal religious toleration, 83. marries Darnley, *Ib.* legal objections to her claims upon England, 84. her judgment upon Darnley's appearance, 85. accused as an accessory to Darnley's murder, 87. attends English prayers, 99. writes in excuse to the Pope, 100. sought in marriage by the duke of Norfolk, 109. her letters to him, 253. her correspondence conducted by means of Throgmorton, 315. offers to join the Association, 323. denies the truth of Parry's accusation, 332. corresponds by means of Babington, 343. implicated in his conspiracy, 345. writes to Persons, approving of Philip's designs, 348. tried, 349. executed, *Ib.*
Mass, attendance at, in the houses of foreign ambassadors, 251
Matchet, 200
Matrimonial office, words in objected-to, at Hampton-court, 539
Matthew, Tobias (successively bishop of Durham, and archbishop of York), at Hampton-court, 531. particulars of, 605
Maur, Raban, decisive testimony of, against transubstantiation, 211
Mayne, Cuthbert, 255
Medina Sidonia, duke of, said to have determined upon shewing no particular favour to English Romanists, 359
Melvil, Sir James, remark of, upon Darnley, 85
Mendoza, Bernardin de, concerned with Throgmorton, 316. withdraws to Paris, 319
Mercuriano, general of the Jesuits, objects to send his order into England, 261
Mey, Dr., refused a grace to Cartwright, 140
Midnight services, neglect of, 132
Mildmay, Sir Walter, communicates a royal answer to the House of Commons, 221. speaks in parliament against Romish reconcilements, 282

Millenary Petition, the, 518. answered by the two universities, 521. arbitrary treatment from it, 530
Monaster Neva, 281
Monastic pillage, abuse of, 583
Monks, one of the last old English, death of, 487
Monopolies, royal abandonment of, 514
Montague, Dr., at Hampton-court, 531
Moore, the Jesuit historian, testimony of, to the glory of Elizabeth's reign, 592
More, pretences of, to cast out devils, 481. deposed from the ministry, 483
Morgan, Thomas, intent upon the deliverance of Mary Queen of Scots, 318. implicated with Ballard, 342. refuses to join the Spanish party, 359
Morgan, William, successively bishop of Llandaff and St. Asaph, particulars of, 611
Morice, attorney of the Court of Wards, puritanical speech of, in the House of Commons, 411. imprisoned, *Ib.*
Morton, Dr. Nicholas, mission of, 108
Morton, the regent, delivers up the earl of Northumberland, 118
Mosaic law taken as the pattern of Christian jurisprudence, 364
Mountacute, Lord, objection of, to Jesuits and Seminarists, 360
Mullins, Archdeacon, procures extensive conformity at his visitation, 44

Names of heathen origin, denounced, 139
Nash replies to *Mar-Prelate*, 374
National synod holden by the Disciplinarians, 383
Navy, project for firing the, 436
Nelson, 256. 257
Neville, Edmund, connected with Parry, 330
Neville, Dean, sent into Scotland by Archbishop Whitgift, 517
Nicholas, Henry, founder of the Family of Love, 214
Norfolk, tumult in, 125
Norfolk, Thomas Howard, duke of, tempted by the prospect of marrying the queen of Scots, 109. ordered to court, but delays, 111. committed to the Tower, 112. executed, 252
Northampton, puritanical movements at, 159. prayers for the dead discontinued in, 244
Northumberland, Thomas Percy, earl of, summoned to court, 113. rebels, 114. flees into Scotland, 117. delivered up and executed, 118. Henry Percy, earl of, death and particulars of, 347
Norton, Richard, standard-bearer in the northern rebellion, 115
Norwich, dean and chapter, case of, 487
Novatians, 52
Nowell, Alexander, dean of St. Paul's, *Pacification* of, 51. attendance of, upon the duke of Norfolk, at execution, 252. disputation with Campion, 297.

Oath, *ex officio*, nature of, 403. its legality questioned, *Ib.* defended by Cosin, 404. used by Calvin, 405. taken by some ministers, 407. refused by Cartwright, 389

Oflet, 243

Old Hall Green, Romish college at, 93

O'Neil, Hugh, earl of Tyrone, insurrection of, 496. his phœnix plume, 497

Ordination, hastiness of, at the queen's accession, 34. episcopal, sometimes dispensed with, *Ib.* of non-preachers, denounced, 139. Whitingham's case of, 230. Presbyterian, legal validity of, maintained by Travers, but denied by Whitgift, 443

Organization, puritanical, 383

Orthodoxy, Protestant, questioned by Romanists, 234

Orton, renounces the Pope's deposing power, 305

Ossat, Cardinal d', reasons against the papal plan for changing the English succession, 506

Overall, John, dean of St. Paul's (afterwards successively bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, and Norwich), at Hampton-court, 531. 544. prepares the addition to the catechism, 552

Page, disperser of Stubbe's pamphlet, 238

Paget, Charles, implicated with Throgmorton, 316. joint administrator of her French dowry for Mary Queen of Scots, 342. received at Petworth-house, 347. not of the Spanish party, 359

Palmia, an alleged authority for regicide, 332

Papal pretensions, unconstitutional, 410. said, at Hampton-court, to be insufficiently disclaimed in the Thirty-nine Articles, 538

Paris, Matthew, published by Archbishop Parker, 209

Parker, Archbishop, argues in favour of retaining crosses, 15. his views of the habits, 19. interferes for Sampson, 55. makes arrangements for suppressing irregularities, 42. has an altercation with Mr. Wentworth, 149. complains of Machiavellian policy, 157. complains of ill usage of the bishops, 162. provides for answering the *Admonition to the Parliament*, 174. disapproves of the restoration of Dering, 192. thought lightly of his learning, 193. corresponds about the prophesyings, 200. alarmed by the intelligence of a sham plot, 201. visits the Isle of Wight, 203. reproved by the queen, 204. death, 205. his remains disturbed, 206. procures a revised edition of the Bible, 208. overlooks the work *De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ*, 208. has both Sanders and Cartwright answered, 209. publishes some valuable pieces of English history, *Ib.* also Elfric against transubstantiation, 210. also the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, *Ib.* wrote upon the marriage of priests, 211. an important preserver of MSS., 212. writes about a congregation of anabaptists, 213. thought Grindal too lenient, 220. denounced as *Pope of Lambeth*, 227. refused to excuse the attendance of Browne, under plea of privilege, 229. alarmed by the Paris massacre, 250. kept the queen firm to her religious choice, 514

Parkhurst, John, bishop of Norwich, forbids the prophesyings, 200. particulars of him, *Ib.* deluded by some impostures, 203

Parliamentary, improper use of the term towards the English prelacy. 72

Parr, William, marquess of Northampton, 62

Parry, William, speaks against additional severity to Romanists, 325. early life, 326. sues for the mastership of St. Catharine's, 330. appeals to Allen's authority to justify assassination, 331. arrested, 335. expelled the House of Commons, 336. tried, *Ib.* executed, 337

Patronage, ecclesiastical, denounced as an usurpation, 139

Paul IV., 601

Pearson, chaplain to Archbishop Parker, visits Field and Wilcox in prison, 174

Pembroke, William Herbert, earl of, ordered to court, 112

Penry, John, early history of, 422. principally concerned in the *Mar-Prelate* tracts, 371. 423. apprehended, *Ib.* his principles, 424. 425. 428. tried, 426. executed, 427

Peretti, Felix: see Sixtus V.

Perez, Anthony, 434

Perkins, W., *Golden Chain*, by, 464

Persons, Robert, seminary-oath attributed to him, 94. selected for the English mission, 261. orders for his apprehension issued, 263. his early history, 264. arrives again in England, 274. begins upon political agitation, 275. offended with Heywood, 284. holds a meeting of the missionaries in London, 285. partially admitted as a superior by the Romish clergy, *Ib.* prepares an answer to the royal proclamation, 286. goes into the country, *Ib.* his final meeting with Campion, 290. escapes to the Continent, 293. his own account of himself, *Ib.* character of him, 309. charged with privity to Parry's treason, 332. secretly travelling in England during Babington's conspiracy, 348. receives a letter from the queen of Scots approving of Philip's designs, *Ib* professes her intention of leaving the English crown to Philip, *Ib.* defends the desertion of Stanley, 353. charged with the real authorship of Allen's *Admonition*, 356. attacks Sir E. Coke upon the supremacy, 398. denies the *Philopater*, 414. canvasses for the *Infanta*, 432. publishes *Doleman*, *Ib.* apologises for it to James I., *Ib.* said to have discouraged plots against the life of Elizabeth, 436. his view of the succession, 498. leaves the court of Spain, 499. thinks Romish prelacy desirable for England, 506. speaks highly of the seminarists, 571. death, 575. talked-of for a cardinal, *Ib.*

Perth, mischievous effects of a sermon there by Knox, 83

Petition in favour of Romanism, 338

Philip, forbearance of the English court towards, 437

Phœnix plume, alleged, papal present of, 497

Pickering, Lewis, a libeller of Archbishop Whitgift, 565

Piers, Archbishop, particulars of, 603

Pilkington, James, bishop of Durham, opposes the habits, 22. writes against them to Leicester, 49. particulars of him, 605

Piscator, attacked by Baron, 472

Pits, embarrassed by Matthew Paris, 209

Pius IV. confirms the Trentine decrees, and labours for their general acceptance, 5. his creed, 601

Pius V. early history, 88. elected pope, 89. superstition, *Ib.* authorizes the Trentine Catechism, *Ib.* violent language, 109. excommunicates the queen, 120. canonized, 123. death, *Ib.* dates, 601.

Platform, puritanical, 138

Plowden, counsel to Boner, 72

Plumbers' Hall, puritanical congregation at, 76

Pluralities, bill brought in for the abolition of, 375. attacked in Elizabeth's last parliament, 501. justified at Hampton-court, 543

Popes, during the Elizabethan period, 601

Popham, C. J., endeavours to suppress Dr. Bound's book, 461

Possevino, embarrassed by Matthew Paris, 209

Pound, Thomas, prints Campion's answer to the royal proclamation, 286. committed to the Tower, 287

Prayers for the dead, continuance of, 244

Preacher, and no Sacrament minister, 242

Preachers, deficiency of, 33

Preaching, exclusive claims of, denied at Hampton-court, 543. licenses for, called in, 158

Predestinarian controversy, 463

Predestination, doctrine of, treated at Hampton-court, 544

Prelacy, during the Elizabethan period, 603

Presbytery, assumed certain prevalence of, 364

Press, liberty of the, restrained, 70. objected-to by the Puritans, at Hampton-court, 539

Preston, Thomas, opponent of Cartwright in a philosophy act, 142

Proclamations against Puritanism, 193. 194

Prohibitions, motions for, 516

Prophesyings, instituted at Northampton, 160. disliked by the queen, 199. partially suppressed, 200. completely so, 226. restoration of, required at Hampton-court, 539

Prynne, attacks the memory of Archbishop Whitgift, 565

Puckering, Serjeant, Speaker of the House of Commons, 325. as lord keeper, states ancient cases in favour of the royal supremacy, 410. states the queen's pleasure to parliament, 412

Puritans, irregularities in ministration by, 39. treated as few and conceited, 41. 64. origin of the name, 52. avail themselves of the Cambridge preaching licenses, 58. their vestural scruples termed fanatical, 60. many of their sermons chiefly invectives against externals, 63. write against the vestures, *Ib.* originally objected to little else, 67. extend their objections, 68. injudiciously met, 69. make great use of the press, 70. display considerable violence against the vestures, 74. think of separation, 75. use the Genevan liturgy, *Ib.* make a congregation at Plumbers' Hall, 76. their character assumed by Papists, 78. date given by Cecil to their objections to the liturgy, 79. agreed doctrinally with the Church party, 137. their principles, 138. formed into a disciplinarian party by Cartwright, 144. discredited by some impostures, 202. consider Archbishop Grindal *their own*, 218. undermine ancient religious usages, 243. take the Mosaic law as obligatory upon Christians, 364. much supported in the cabinet, 366. maintain that property once given to religion is inalienably belonging to it, 379. require subscription, 408. intolerant to Independency, 414. consult about terminating both the Romish and the Brownist schisms, 415. denounced as hypocrites by the Barrowists, 417. declared by them to shrink from the full consequences of their own principles, 421. date assigned to their discipline, 445. their friends at the council-board, 514. endeavour to win James I. on his accession, 515. move for prohibitions, 516. many of them outward conformists, 519. their objections on the accession of James, *Ib.* evidently not the extent of their views, 521. 530. object to liberty of the press, 539. surprised by James's ability at Hampton-court, 562

Raleigh, Sir Walter, countenances the report of Northumberland's assassination, 348. conspires, 522

Reading and ministering ministers, 242

Reasons, Ten, Campion's, 287

Rebellion, the northern, 114

Reconcilements to Rome made penal, 282. evils of them, 573

Recusancy, Romish, legal nature of, 413. chiefly among females, 578. compositions for, 361. Protestant, act against, 413. continued, 416

Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, laid before the House of Commons, 148

Regeneration, baptismal, maintained by James I., 535

Religion, number of executions for, 595

Re-ordination, 255

Retainers, 310

Reynolds, Dr., particulars of, 554. accuses Coranus of Pelagianism, 457. proposes to add the Lambeth Articles to the Thirty-nine, at Hampton-court, 467

Rheims, disputes upon regicide at, 341

Rhemish Testament, animadversions upon, undertaken by Cartwright, 558

Riario, Cardinal, treats with Spain about an invasion of Elizabeth's dominions, 576

Ridolfi, Robert, seditious agency of, 98. arrested, 110

Ring in marriage, not objected-to at Hampton-court, 539

Rippon, Roger, libellous inscription upon the coffin of, 419

Rishton, Edward, 262
Rizzio, murder of, 86
Robinson, Bishop, at Hampton-court, 531. particulars of him, 610
Rogne, M., testimony of, to the Church of England, 542
Romanism merely in possession at the Reformation, 5
Romanists, attendance of, at church, during the queen's first years, 10. thought to be two-thirds of the nation then, 13. yet few certainly known, 567. flee to the Continent, 38. object discordancy to Protestantism, 39
Romish conformity, general, 128. *Declaration* against, 129. recusancy, beginning of, on a large scale, 127. 129. priests, protestation of the thirteen, 504
Rudd, Bishop, at Hampton-court, 531. particulars of, 611
Ruthven, concerned in Rizzio's murder, 86

Sabbatarian controversy, 459
Sabbath, ancient application of the word, 460
St. Paul's spire, burning of, 131
Saints' days, keeping of, denounced, 139
Sampson, Dr. T., opposition of, to the habits, 29. declines conformity, 45. deprived, 54. subsequent history of, 55. summoned before the High Commission, 159. preached the sermon that inflamed Birchet, 195. concerned in the *Admonition to the Parliament*, 163
Sanders, Nicholas, particulars of, 103. answered by Archbishop Parker's means, 209. lands in Ireland, 278. publishes a letter to the nobility and gentry there, 280. his death, *Ib.*
Sandys, Edwin, archbishop, opposition to the habits, 25. motion of, in convocation, in 1562, against the cross in baptism, and the administration of that sacrament by women, 67. advises the restoration of Dering, 192. wishes for a puritanical disputation, *Ib.* presides in convocation, 222. questions Whittingham's ordination, 230. proposes to execute the Queen of Scots, 345. death of, 365. recommends Hooker to the Temple, 442
Savage, John, treason of, 341
Scambler, Bishop, approves the prophesyings, 160. condemned by Kett, 354. particulars of, 609
Scott, Colonel, disturbs the remains of Archbishop Parker, 206
Scottish ministers, visit of, to Oxford, 382
Scripture, presumed impolicy of re-translating, 542
Sebastian, king of Portugal, 279
Seditious pieces, writing or publishing of, made felony, 420
Seignory, qualified, admitted by Whitgift, 179
Seminaries, Romish, 94. 97. nature of the persons chiefly who entered them, 570
Seminarists, represented as interested, 572
Seminary priests, oath of, 94. accusations against, 95. made liable to the penalties of high treason, 324

Shelley, Richard, presents a petition in favour of the Romanists, 338. able only to substantiate it imperfectly, 339
Sherwin, Ralph, 262. equivocation of, 303. executed, 306. particulars of, 310
Sherwood, 256. 258
Sigismund, king of Poland, obtains the recognition of the Trentine decrees, 5
Simancas, projects of regicide, in the archives of, 436
Simier, agency of, for Anjou, 235
Singing cake, 244.
Singleton, printer to Stubbe, 238
Sixtus V. renews the bulls against Elizabeth, 355. promises a subsidy to Philip, 361. particulars of, 601
Smerwick, 278
Smith, John, answers for Puritans in custody, before Bishop Grindal, 76. qualified subscription of, 161
Snape, re-ordination of, 255
Somerville, John, case of, 310
Sommers, William, 479
Soto, Peter, 12
Spain, accepts the Trentine decrees, 6
Spanish party, the, 360
Sparke, Dr., at Hampton-court, 531
Speaker of the House of Commons, right of voting denied to, 502
Spenser, Dr. John, an editor of Hooker, 446
Sponsors denounced, 139
Squire, treason of, 491
Squire, Dr., offended with Persons, 266
Stafford, Sir Edward, acquaints Elizabeth of plots against her, 319
Stancliffe, 266
Standon, 93
Stanihurst, R., 271
Stanley, Sir William, desertion of, 350
Stapleton, Thomas, intimate with Allen, 93. admires Hooker, 451. particulars of, *Ib.*
Statute-Protestants, 242
Still, Bishop, particulars of, 607
Stonar, Mrs., has a secret press for the printing of Romish books, 313. committal of, *Ib.*
Stone, Thomas, takes the oath *ex officio*, 407
Story, Dr. John, case of, 253
Strickland, Mr., motion of, in the House of Commons, 147
Stuart, Lady Arabella, pedigree of, 498. legal advantage of, 524
Stubbe, particulars of, 236. loses his right hand, 239. answers Allen, 240
Stukely, Thomas, 278
Subscription qualified by act of parliament, 49. not intended for permanence, 151. legally abolished, 158. puritanical, 384. puritan, 408. loosely enforced in the Church, 409. irregular enforcement of, 586

Sunday, new regulations for the observance of, demanded at Hampton-court, 538
Sunday plays, 459
Supremacy, oath of, mitigated under Elizabeth, 581
Surplice, Protestant, different from the Romish, 28. objections to, at Hampton-court, 539
Surplice and ceremonies, objected to, 140

Ter Woort, Hendrick, burning of, 217
Thacker, Elias, hanged for sedition, 420
Throgmorton, Sir George, 314. Sir Nicholas, *Ib.* Sir John, 315. Francis, conducts a clandestine correspondence with Mary of Scotland, *Ib.* arrested, 316. tortured, 317. tried and executed, 320. George, arrested, 321
Toleration, not thought of by Foxe, 316. not maintained in the *Admonition to the Parliament*, 165
Travers, Walter, writes the *Book of Discipline*, 382. forms a puritanical party among the lawyers, 395. particulars of, 443. controversy with Hooker, 444. 456. goes to Dublin, 445
Treason, loose construction of the law of, 259
Tregian, case of, 256
Trentine council, a committee of, decides against Romish attendance at church, 12
Trentine decrees, when confirmed by the pope, 5. first accepted by the Venetians, *Ib.* by Poland, *Ib.* by Spain, 6. never formally by France, *Ib.*
Turks, conformity with, better than with papists, 540
Tyrlough Lynogh, 496

Ucanzius, archbishop of Gnesna, proposes to have the Trentine decrees examined, before approval, 5
Udal, John, influence of, in certain towns of the north, 224. 390
Udalric, St., 243
Underhill, Bishop, particulars of, 609
Uniformity, Act of, habits prescribed by, 26
Unitarians, pronounced by Penry incapable of salvation, 428
Urban VII., particulars of, 602
Utenhovius, 16

Van Mildert, Bishop, munificence of, 213
Veils, worn by women at churching, 245
Venetians, first acceptance of the Trentine decrees by, 5
Vestments disclaimed as principal objects of contention, in the *Admonition to the Parliament*, 166
Vesture controversy, substantial insignificance of, admitted by Sampson and Humphrey, 46. 50
Vincent of Lerins, Catholicity defined by, 7

Virgin Mary's dowry, England represented as, 579
Visitations, episcopal, royal reflections upon, 194
Vitelli, sent into England, in contemplation of the northern rebellion, 110
Voluntary System, Penry's advocacy of, 424

Waad, Sir William, 322
Wafers, sacramental, 244
Walker, Archdeacon, disputes with Campion, 299
Walpole, accused by Squire, 492. exonerated by him, 494
Walsingham, Sir Francis, donation of, to Cartwright, for the confutation of the Rhemish Testament, 558. founds a lectureship of controversial divinity, 554. letter of, to Critoy, 251. published by Archbishop Parker, 209. secretly apprised of Babington's plot, 344. charged with contriving it, 345. proposed endowment for, from the Church, 584. said to have renounced the puritanical party at last, 588
Wandsworth, the first presbytery established at, 186
Watson, Anthony, bishop of Chichester, at Hampton-court, 531. particulars of, 607
Watson, Thomas, deprived bishop of Lincoln, modest behaviour of, at Wisbeach, 489
Watson, William, conspiracy of, 523. arrested, 525. executed, *Ib.* attributes his end to the Jesuits, 526. asks their pardon, 527. particulars of him, *Ib.* not respected as a martyr, 528
Watts, a Romish authority against regicide, 333
Webb, mission of, 108
Wentworth, Peter, altercation of, with Archbishop Parker, 149. reflection upon the bishops by, 162. sequestered, *Ib.* parliamentary boldness of, 220. displeases the queen by a motion about the succession, 412
Westminster, Matthew of, published by Archbishop Parker, 209
Westmoreland, Charles Neville, earl of, summoned to court, 113. flees into Scotland and escapes into Flanders, 117
Weston, *alias* Edmonds, desires to be acknowledged agent of the prisoners at Wisbeach, 489
Whitaker, Dr. William, thinks lightly of Cartwright, 178. a high Calvinist, 464. principal framer of the Lambeth Articles, 467. death, 469. his *clerum*, 471. answers Campion's *Ten Reasons*, 289. esteemed by Bellarmine, 290
Whitgift, John, offers disputation to Cartwright, 140. deprives him of his fellowship, 145. answers the *Admonition to Parliament*, 175. consecrated to Worcester, *Ib.* dissuaded from continuing the controversy with Cartwright, 179. admits some sort of a seignory, *Ib.* claims large privileges for the sovereign, 180. declares against the validity of Whittingham's ordination, 232. refuses Canterbury during Grindal's life, 367. accepts it, 368. directed to search for the authors, &c., of the *Mar-Prelate* libels,

371. assists Bishop Cowper in answering them, 374. absent from court when Cartwright appeared, 390. seems to have interceded for Udal's life, 394. testifies the obstinacy of Cawdrey, 396. disapproves of releasing the Puritan leaders without a full submission, 401. latterly upon good terms with Cartwright, 402. wishes a second conference between him and Barrow, 421. libelled in the coffin-plate inscription of R. Rippon, 420. charged with procuring the deaths of Barrow, Greenwood, and Penry, 427. frustrates a commission of concealment, 441. says that Whittingham, if he had lived, would have been deprived, 443. protects Hooker, 444. obtains Bishop's Bourn for him, 445. endeavours to suppress Dr. Bound's book, 461. biassed generally in favour of Calvinism, 465. patronises Archbishop Harsnet, 466. censures some of the retractation extorted from Barret, *Ib.* excuses himself to the queen for authorizing the Lambeth Articles, 468. declares her favourable to their general tenour, *Ib.* represents them as conformable to the Thirty-nine, 469. protects Baron, 472. the probable extent of his Calvinism, 474. abandons Calvin's view of Christ's descent into hell, 477. sits upon Darel's case, 483. charged with electioneering interference, 485. recommends regulations for the ecclesiastical courts, 501. draws up reasons for the continuance of pluralities, 502. attends the queen in her last illness, 508. kept her firm to her religious choice, 514. displeased by motions for prohibitions, 516. speaks contemptuously of common lawyers, *Ib.* uneasy at the prospect of James's accession, 517. sends Dr. Neville into Scotland, *Ib.* uneasy during his last summer, 521. procures answers to the puritanical publications, *Ib.* comes to the Hampton-court conference, 531. denies any regular authority for private baptism by females and laymen, 534. nominates two bishops for the second day's conference at Hampton-court, 537. pays a blasphemous compliment to the king, 550. 562. uneasy at the prospect of a new parliament, 555. chooses Barlow to publish an account of the Hampton-court conference, *Ib.* seized with his last illness, *Ib.* death, 556. character, 557. prevents Cartwright from publishing against the Rhemish Testament, 558. kept a large establishment, 559. thought favourably of Essex, 560. 561. reasons for his large establishment, *Ib.* charitable, *Ib.* founds an hospital and free-school at Croydon, 562. his humility there, *Ib.* his occasional state, *Ib.* his freedom of expostulation with the queen, *Ib.* his Calvinistic bias, 563. a constant preacher, *Ib.* made a privy councillor when Leicester was abroad, *Ib.* never interfered in secular business, 564. libelled after his death, 565. his memory attacked by Prynne, *Ib.* offered the chancellorship, *Ib.* vice-president of the marches of Wales, *Ib.*

Whittingham, Dean, view of the habits taken by, 18. writes against them to Leicester, 49. irregular ordination of, 34. not sanctioned by Calvin, *Ib.* conformity of, 57. one of the translators of the

Genevan Bible, 207. ordination of, questioned, 230. particulars of him, 232. ordination of, pronounced legally insufficient by Whitgift, 443
Wickham, Bishop, particulars of, 606
Wickliffe, high estimation of, by Penry, 425
Wielmacker, John, burning of, 217
Wilcox, concerned in the *Admonition to the Parliament*, 163. imprisoned, 173
Williams, a treasonable agent for Fuentes, 436
Wisbeach Castle, Romish committals to, on the approach of the *Armada*, 358. quarrels of the prisoners in, 488
Withers, G., puritanical violence of, 57. suspended, 58. conforms, 59
Wolton, Bishop, particulars of, 608
Workington, 79
Worship with my body, explanation of, 547
Wray, Sir Christopher, judgment of, as to subscription, 151
Wyat, Sir Thomas, case of, drawn into precedent, 196

Yates, Edward, 291
York, Rowland, desertion of, 350
Yorke, a treasonable agent for Fuentes, 436
Young, T., Archbishop of York, opposition of, to the habits, 20

London:
John W. Parker, St. Martin's Lane.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Octavo, 10*s.* 6*d.*

THE ANGLO-SAXON CHURCH;

ITS HISTORY, REVENUES,

AND

GENERAL CHARACTER.

THE SECOND EDITION, REVISED AND CORRECTED.

DATE DUE

HIGHSMITH #45230

Printed
in USA

177213
283.046J
Soll

Soames, Henry
c. 2

Elizabethan religious history.

28 3.046J
177213
Soll
c. 2

St. Mark's Library
The General Theological Seminary
175 Ninth Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10011

Please stamp date in left column, write your name legibly in center column and leave right column blank. Deposit circulation card in slot marked 'Circulation cards'.

There is no date due, but books must be returned promptly upon request. Do not lend books charged to you to others. You are responsible for them.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
00117750